

## Table of Contents

### 101 – TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF)/CALIFORNIA WORK OPPORTUNITY AND RESPONSIBILITY TO KIDS (CalWORKs) PROGRAMS

#### 101 CalWORKs ASSISTANCE

General Fund Maintenance of Effort Adjustment .....	1
Two-Parent Program (matches to Auxiliary Table) .....	3
Basic Grants .....	5
Hurricane Katrina .....	9
Welfare Reform/Work Participation .....	17
<u>Guillen v. Schwarzenegger</u> .....	27
July 2005 MAP COLA .....	29
July 2006 MAP COLA .....	31
Pay for Performance .....	33
AFDC Collections .....	35
Tribal TANF .....	37
Cal Learn Bonuses and Sanctioned Grants .....	81
CalWORKs Safety Net Program .....	63
Prospective Budgeting .....	41
Recent Noncitizen Entrants .....	51
<u>Rosales v. Thompson</u> .....	159

#### 101 CalWORKs SERVICES

Employment Training Fund .....	55
CalWORKs Basic .....	57
Single Allocation Adjustment .....	59
Welfare Reform/Work Participation .....	17
Participation Improvement Project .....	61
Hurricane Katrina .....	9
CalWORKs Safety Net Program .....	63
Substance Abuse Services .....	67
Mental Health Services .....	69
Mental Health and/or Substance Abuse for Indian Health Clinics .....	71
County Performance Incentives .....	73
Effect of EDD Wagner Peyser Reimbursement .....	75
Recent Noncitizen Entrants .....	51

## **101 CalWORKs SERVICES (continued):**

Tribal TANF .....	37
TANF Pass-Through for State Agencies.....	77
Employment Retention and Advancement Services Grant.....	79

## **101 TEEN PROGRAMS**

Cal Learn .....	81
Recent Noncitizen Entrants .....	51

## **101 CalWORKs - ADMINISTRATION**

TANF/CalWORKs Administrative Costs - Basic .....	87
Carryforward from 2004-05 .....	91
Administrative Augmentation .....	93
Single Allocation Reduction .....	95
Hurricane Katrina .....	9
CalWORKs Safety Net Program .....	63
Legacy Systems Savings.....	97
Tribal TANF .....	37
Fraud Recovery Incentives .....	101
PA to NA Fund Shift.....	103
Administrative Cap Adjustment.....	105
Court Cases .....	107
Recent Noncitizen Entrants .....	51
Medi-Cal Services Eligibility/Common Costs .....	109
Research and Evaluation.....	111
County Maintenance of Effort (MOE) Adjustment.....	113
Prospective Budgeting .....	41
Prospective Budgeting Augmentation .....	115
<u>Rosales v. Thompson</u> .....	159

## **101 CalWORKs CHILD CARE PROGRAMS**

CalWORKs Child Care - Stage One Services and Administration.....	117
Hurricane Katrina .....	9
Welfare Reform/Work Participation.....	17
CalWORKs Safety Net Program .....	63
Stage One Child Care RMR Impact.....	121
Recent Noncitizen Entrants .....	51

## **101 CalWORKs CHILD CARE PROGRAMS (continued):**

State-Only Cal Learn Child Care .....	123
Trustline .....	125
Self-Certification.....	129
Transfer to CDE for Stage Two.....	131
Child Care Stage One/Two Holdback .....	135

## **101 KIN-GAP PROGRAM**

Kin-GAP Basic Costs .....	137
Kin-GAP Administration .....	137

## **101 FOSTER CARE PROGRAM**

Title IV-E Child Support Collections.....	141
Foster Family Home Basic Costs.....	143
Group Home Basic Costs .....	147
Foster Family Agency Basic Costs .....	149
Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children Basic Costs.....	151
Supplemental Clothing Allowance .....	153
Title XX Foster Care .....	155
<u>Rosales v. Thompson</u> .....	159
<u>Rosales v. Thompson (Reversal)</u> .....	163
Promoting Safe and Stable Families Savings.....	165
Supportive Transitional Emancipation Program.....	167
Emergency Assistance Program -- Foster Care Welfare .....	169
Improving Adoptions Outcomes.....	411
Title IV-E Disallowance .....	171
Title IV-E Foster Parent Child Care Program.....	173
Foster Care - Infant Rate (SB 500) .....	175

## **101 ADOPTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**

Basic Costs .....	177
<u>Rosales v. Thompson</u> .....	159
Improving Adoptions Outcome.....	411

## **101 REFUGEE CASH ASSISTANCE**

Basic Costs .....	179
Prospective Budgeting .....	41

## **101 CALIFORNIA FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM**

Emergency Food Assistance Fund .....	181
California Food Assistance Program .....	183
Simplification Options .....	275
Prospective Budgeting .....	41
SUA Mid-Year Adjustment .....	187

## **111 - SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME/STATE SUPPLEMENTARY PAYMENT (SSI/SSP)/IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES**

### **111 SSI/SSP**

Basic Costs .....	189
January 2006 COLA .....	191
January 2007 COLA .....	193
SSI/SSP In-kind Support Cost .....	195
SSP Administration .....	197
California Veterans Cash Benefit .....	199
Deficit Reduction Act of 2005.....	201
Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) - Base Program .....	203
CAPI - Extended Time Limit .....	203
Hurricane Katrina .....	9
SSP MOE Eligible .....	207

### **111 IN-HOME SUPPORTIVE SERVICES (IHSS)**

Personal Care Services Program/Residual IHSS Basic Costs .....	211
CMIPS and Associated Costs.....	217
CMIPS Enhancements.....	221
CMIPS II Contract Procurement .....	223
Public Authority Administration .....	225
PCSP/Residual Three-Month Retroactive Benefit .....	229
IHSS Quality Assurance .....	233
Income Eligible Shift Share of Cost (SOC) Buyout .....	237
Waiver Personal Care Services .....	239
<u>Tyler v. Anderson</u> Settlement & Implementation.....	241
Waiver Program/Medi-Cal State Plan Amendment for Residual Program.....	243
Title XIX Reimbursements (IHSS/CSBG/CWS).....	247

## **111 IHSS ADMINISTRATION**

Basic Costs .....	249
PCSP Three-Month Retroactive Benefit .....	229
County Employer of Record (AB 2235).....	251
Court Cases .....	253
IHSS Advisory Committees.....	255
IHSS Quality Assurance .....	233
Forms Requirement for Waiver .....	243

## **141 - COUNTY ADMINISTRATION**

### **141 FOSTER CARE**

FC & NAFS Administrative Costs - Basic Costs .....	257
Legacy Systems Savings.....	97
<u>Rosales v. Thompson</u> .....	159
STEP Eligibility .....	167
Improving Adoptions Outcomes.....	411
Foster Care Reforms .....	261
Emergency Assistance - Foster Care Welfare.....	169
Court Cases .....	107

### **141 FOOD STAMPS ADMINISTRATION**

Basic Costs .....	257
Hurricane Katrina .....	9
Legacy Systems Savings.....	97
Food Stamp Administrative Reduction.....	263
Food Stamp Sanction Reinvestment .....	265
Employment and Training Program .....	267
California Nutrition Network .....	269
UC Food Stamp Nutrition Education Plan.....	271
PA to NA Fund Shift .....	103
Prospective Budgeting .....	41
Prospective Budgeting Augmentation.....	115
Transitional Benefits .....	273
Simplification Options .....	275
Income Exclusion for Deployed Military .....	281
California Food Assistance Program .....	183

## **141 REFUGEE CASH ASSISTANCE**

Refugee Cash Assistance - Administration.....	285
Prospective Budgeting .....	41

## **141 AUTOMATION UPDATES**

Simplification Options .....	275
Income Exclusion for Deployed Military .....	281

## **141 AUTOMATION PROJECTS**

Statewide Project Management .....	287
SAWS - Welfare Data Tracking Implementation Project.....	289
Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System (ISAWS) .....	291
ISAWS Migration.....	293
LEADER.....	295
Welfare Client Data System (WCDS) .....	297
Consortium IV (C-IV) Implementation .....	299
SAWS/CCSAS Interface .....	301
Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System (SFIS).....	303
Electronic Benefits Transfer Project M&O .....	305
Electronic Benefits Transfer Project Reprocurement.....	307

## **151 SOCIAL SERVICE PROGRAMS**

### **151 CHILD WELFARE SERVICES**

Basic Costs .....	309
Federal Budget Bill - Loss of FFP .....	315
Improving Adoptions Outcomes Savings .....	411
Augmentation to Child Welfare Services .....	317
CWS/CMS System Support Staff.....	319
Emergency Assistance Program.....	321
Title XX Transfer to DSS .....	155
State Family Preservation - Permanent Transfer.....	325
Promoting Safe and Stable Families .....	327
Independent Living Program .....	329
Extended Independent Living Program .....	331
Chafee Postsecondary Education and Training Voucher .....	333
Transitional Housing for Foster Youth (AB 427) .....	335
Transitional Housing for Foster Youth (AB 1119) .....	337
STEP - Transitional Independent Living Plan Activity .....	167

## **151 CHILD WELFARE SERVICES (continued):**

Emancipated Foster Youth Stipends .....	339
Recruitment and Retention of Social Workers .....	341
Child Welfare Training Program .....	343
Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Demo Project (Options for Recovery) .....	345
Pass-Through Title IV-E Costs .....	347
Foster Parent Training and Recruitment.....	351
Minor Parent Services and Investigations.....	353
Foster Care - Infant Rate (SB 500) .....	175
Dependency Drug Courts .....	355
Kinship Support Services.....	357
Kinship and Foster Care Emergency Funds .....	359
CWS/CMS Staff Development .....	361
CWS/CMS Ongoing M&O.....	363
CWS/CMS Project: Go Forward Plan .....	365
CWS/CMS Application Server Replacement .....	367
CWS/CMS New System .....	369
Child Health and Safety .....	371
Supportive and Therapeutic Options Program (STOP) .....	373
Group Home Monthly Visits .....	375
Background Checks.....	377
Relative Home Approvals .....	379
Multiple Relative Home Approvals .....	381
Grievance Review for Relatives.....	383
Live Scan Technology.....	385
Health Services for Children in Foster Care .....	387
County Self-Assessment and SIP .....	389
Data Requirements for New Activities .....	391
Peer Quality Case Reviews .....	393
Statewide Standardized Training.....	395
CWS Program Improvement Fund.....	397
CWS DR, SA, and PYs .....	399
CWS DR, SA, and PYs - County Expansion.....	401
CWS Outcome Improvement Plan.....	403
AB 408 Child Relationships (amended by AB 1412) .....	405

## **151 ADOPTIONS PROGRAM**

Basic Costs .....	409
Improving Adoptions Outcomes .....	411
Private Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments .....	415
Foster and Adoptive Home Recruitment .....	417
County Counsel Costs .....	419
Nonrecurring Adoption Expenses .....	421
Specialized Training for Adoptive Parents (STAP) .....	423
Nonresident Petitions for Adoption .....	425
Adoption Opportunity Grant .....	427

## **151 CHILD ABUSE PREVENTION PROGRAM**

County Third Party Contracts.....	429
Federal Grants .....	431
State Children's Trust Fund Program .....	433

## **151 COUNTY SERVICES BLOCK GRANT**

Basic Costs .....	435
Adult Protective Services .....	437
APS Contract for Training Curriculum and Services .....	439
Enterprise Community Grant .....	441

## **151 COMMUNITY CARE LICENSING**

Foster Family Home-Basic Costs .....	443
Family Child Care Home-Basic Costs.....	445
<u>Gresher v. Anderson</u> .....	447
Court Cases .....	449
Title XX Funding .....	155
Fee-Exempt Live Scan.....	451

## **151 SPECIAL PROGRAMS**

Other Specialized Services.....	453
Eligibility Extension of Dog Food Allowance .....	455
Access Assistance/Deaf - Basic Costs .....	457
Access Assistance/Deaf - Title XX Funding .....	155
Refugee Employment Social Services .....	459
Targeted Assistance .....	461
Refugee School Impact Grant.....	463



<b>153 - TITLE IV-E WAIVER START-UP .....</b>	<b>465</b>
---	------------

**TANF**

**OTHER DEPARTMENTS' TANF MOE ELIGIBLE EXPENDITURES**

Community Colleges Expansion of Services to TANF Eligibles .....	467
CDE Child Care Programs.....	469
\$50 State Disregard Payment to Families .....	473
EDD Employment Training Fund .....	475

**ADDITIONAL TANF/MOE**

General Fund Maintenance of Effort Work Participation Rate Adjustment .....	477
High Performance Bonus Award.....	479
Total TANF Reserve .....	481
TANF Reauthorization Reserve .....	483

## **General Fund Maintenance of Effort Adjustment**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the State expenditures necessary to meet the State's maintenance of effort (MOE) level. Under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program, the states are required to meet MOE funding levels. California's MOE level is approximately \$2.9 billion, which is equal to 80 percent of California's Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1994 expenditures. For State Fiscal Years (FYs) 2005-06 and 2006-07, an adjustment has been made that reflects the fact that California met the federal work participation rate for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program in FFYs 2003 and 2004. When the State meets this rate, the MOE level falls from 80 percent to 75 percent. In addition, adjustments are made to the MOE as a result of Tribal TANF. Therefore, with the Work Participation Rate and Tribal TANF MOE Adjustments, the final MOE level is \$2.7 billion.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on October 1, 1996.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

To determine the State General Fund (GF) MOE adjustment, projected state and county expenditures countable toward the MOE are compared to the State's MOE level. This determines the amount of expenditures necessary to meet the State's MOE level.

The specific methodology used to determine the GF MOE adjustment involves identifying those projected California Department of Social Services' (CDSS) local assistance expenditures that are TANF- eligible and calculating their costs by total, federal, state, county, and reimbursement funds. Projected federal TANF expenditures for CDSS State support are then added to the federal funds amount. Other state department or county expenditures for TANF eligibles, which meet the MOE requirements, are also added to the CDSS state and county TANF costs. This total is then compared to the State's MOE level. The amount of projected expenditures above or below the MOE level is shifted to or from federal TANF funds. The GF MOE adjustment does not change the total funding available.

Both the current year and budget year projections include projected GF expenditures within other state departments that are assumed countable toward fulfilling the TANF MOE requirement. Separate premise descriptions for each of these items are provided in the "Estimate Methodologies" section of this binder.

### **FUNDING:**

The GF MOE adjustment transfers costs to meet the State's MOE level. The transfer is offset by a corresponding reverse adjustment to federal TANF funds. There is no change in the total funds available.

## General Fund Maintenance of Effort Adjustment

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The countable MOE expenditures within CDSS have been updated to reflect any new and/or revised premises. In addition, countable expenditures within other state departments have been updated to reflect changes in their proposed budget levels or the portion of total cost countable toward the TANF MOE. For specific explanations of these changes, please refer to the specific premise descriptions for each of these items.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The adjustment amount has been updated based upon projected expenditures and new premise items for FY 2006-07.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	-960,929	-917,386
State	960,929	917,386
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Two-Parent Program

### DESCRIPTION:

The Two-Parent Program reflects the funding shift from Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) to State General Fund (GF). The Two-Parent Program is a separately funded state program for two-parent families in the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program. With the implementation of this program, federal TANF funds will no longer be used to provide CalWORKs cash assistance or welfare-to-work (WTW) services, including child care and work support services, to two-parent assistance units (AUs) who meet the definition of a two-parent family. A two-parent family is defined as an AU that includes two aided nondisabled, natural or adoptive parents of the same aided or Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment minor child (living in the home), unless both parents are aided minors and neither is the head-of-household. The eligibility and work participation requirements for two-parent families will remain unchanged from the CalWORKs Program.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1999.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 10553.
- Within the existing CalWORKs Program areas of grants, services, administration and childcare, a portion of the cost or savings for each premise item impacted by the Two-Parent Program will be charged to the State-Only Two-Parent Program. A separate auxiliary table reflects the individual premise items impacted by the Two-Parent Program.
- The grant and administrative ratios for two parent families are based on the current year and budget year All Other Families and Two-Parent caseload projections.
- For Stage One Child Care, the two-parent ratio is five percent based on child care expenditure data from Calendar Year 2005.
- For Employment Services, the ratio for two-parents participating in WTW activities is 5.84 percent and is based on expenditure data for FY 2002-03.
- The ratio for two-parents participating in the CalWORKs Mental Health and Substance Abuse programs is 14.4 percent and is based on WTW 25 and WTW 25A caseload data for FY 2004-05.

### METHODOLOGY:

For each premise item impacted by the Two-Parent Program, the total cost/savings was multiplied by the appropriate ratio for two-parent families. The two-parent families' share from all of the premises were added together to determine the total. Refer to the auxiliary table for the "Two-Parent Program" for more detailed information.

## Two-Parent Program

### FUNDING:

The Two-Parent Program funding for administration, services, and child care costs is 100 percent GF. Funding for Two-Parent Program grants are 97.5 percent GF and 2.5 percent county.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change to CalWORKs Administration, Services, and Child Care in CY. CalWORKs Grants reflects a decrease due to a decline in caseload.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY Child Care cost no longer reflects savings for Los Angeles retroactive payments, Child Care Reform, and 60 Month Time Limits. The BY Administrative cost reflects an increase due to a caseload decline that was offset by the restoration of the Governor's \$25 million baseline veto.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06-	2006-07
Average Monthly Caseload	35,907	34,714

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06		2006-07	
	State	County	State	County
Total	\$385,271	\$7,059	\$387,548	\$6,905
Grants	312,128	7,059	305,979	6,905
Administration	4,962	0	10,168	0
Services	52,884	0	49,139	0
Child Care	15,297	0	22,261	0

## CalWORKs – Basic Grants

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the basic costs of providing cash aid to eligible families. Basic costs have been adjusted to reflect the annual cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) for Social Security (OASDI) benefits. The OASDI COLA increases the benefit level, reducing grant costs. The basic costs have also been adjusted for the impact of specific premises that are in the trend caseload but are also shown as separate premises. These premises include: "Cal Learn Bonuses," "Cal Learn Sanctioned Grants," "Recent Noncitizen Entrants," "Hurricane Katrina," "Rosales vs. Thompson," and "Tribal TANF," that are already in the trend. These adjustments are necessary in order to avoid budgeting the impact twice. This premise also includes an adjustment for Proposition L, which raised the minimum wage level for people working in San Francisco County to \$8.50 in January 2006.

This premise has been updated to reflect the anticipated impact of the Hmong refugees who will be resettling in California in the current year (CY) and budget year (BY).

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11450.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, a total of 11,255,993 All Other Families (AF) personmonths and 1,656,540 Two-Parent (TP) personmonths are anticipated. For FY 2006-07, 11,082,761 AF personmonths and 1,612,722 TP personmonths are projected.
- 85 percent of Hmong refugees resettling in California are projected to establish eligibility for CalWORKs services and benefits as new Hmong refugees. An estimated 1,042 new Hmong refugees (219 AF and 823 TP) are expected to arrive and establish CalWORKs eligibility in CY. An estimated 122 new Hmong refugees (26 AF 96 TP) are expected establish CalWORKs eligibility in BY. The remaining estimated 79 new Hmong refugees (17 AF and 62 TP) are expected to establish CalWORKs eligibility during FY 2007-08, through the end of February 2008.
- Adjustments are made for the estimated costs of current premises which are already included in the base period. These premises include: "Cal Learn Bonuses," "Cal Learn Sanctioned Grants," "Hurricane Katrina," "Rosales vs. Thompson," and "Recent Noncitizen Entrants." Also, an adjustment is made for the costs associated with new tribes establishing Tribal TANF programs.
- Costs are included for the Diversion Program. Based on the most recent CalWORKs Cash Grant Caseload Movement Reports (CA 237) and CalWORKs Expenditure Reports (CA 800D), the average monthly diversion caseload is estimated at 107 with an average cost per case of \$1,628 for the CY, and an average monthly caseload of 103 with an average cost per case of \$1,628 for the budget year (BY).
- The AF cost per person is \$226.05 for both the CY and the BY. The TP cost per person is \$167.57 for both the CY and BY.
- AF and TP basic costs are adjusted for the OASDI COLA. The Consumer Price Index (CPI) COLAs are 4.1 percent effective January 1, 2006, and 2.1 percent effective January 1, 2007.

## CalWORKs – Basic Grants

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- The OASDI COLA adjustment reflects the impact of the projected CPI COLAs on the average Social Security Benefits received by CalWORKs cases, resulting in a FY 2005-06 reduction of \$2,608,490 and a FY 2006-07 reduction of \$4,533,095.
- Proposition L, the minimum wage increase for San Francisco County, will result in approximately \$400,861 in grant savings in FY 2005-06, and \$1,220,455 in grant savings in FY 2006-07 due to nearly 1,700 recipients having additional earnings.
- The CY and BY reflect a shift of funds from the Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNE) program associated with persons in mixed cases that are TANF-eligible.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The personmonths are multiplied by the cost per person to determine AF and TP basic costs.
- AF and TP basic costs are reduced for the OASDI COLA adjustment
- Diversion costs are calculated by multiplying the average monthly caseload by the cost per case, and the annual Diversion costs are added to the basic grant costs.
- The total AF and TP basic costs are reduced by the amounts of the costs for “Cal Learn Bonuses,” “Cal Learn Sanctioned Grants,” “Recent Noncitizen Entrants,” “Hurricane Katrina,” “Rosales vs. Thompson,” new tribes establishing Tribal TANF programs, and Proposition L to reflect the basic grant costs.
- Grant Costs for the Hmong refugees are calculated by multiplying the average persons per month by the cost per person.

### DATA COMPARISON CHART:

#### FY 2005-06

	<u>AF</u>	<u>TP</u>
Projected Personmonths	11,255,993	1,656,540
Projected Casemonths	4,755,963	422,062
Persons Per Case	2.37	3.93

#### FY 2006-07

	<u>AF</u>	<u>TP</u>
Projected Personmonths	11,082,761	1,612,722
Projected Casemonths	4,675,504	408,773
Persons Per Case	2.37	3.95

### FUNDING:

The funding is 87.73 percent federal/TANF, 9.77 percent State General Fund (GF) and 2.50 percent county for both the CY and BY. The state share reflects the GF cost for the State-Only Two-Parent Program that implemented October 1, 1999. The State-Only Two-Parent Program is countable toward the State's maintenance of effort.

The CY and BY reflect a shift of funds from the RNE program associated with persons in mixed cases that are TANF-eligible. These cases are funded with state only funds in this premise.

## CalWORKs – Basic Grants

### CHANGE FROM THE PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The caseload and persons per case have been updated using the most current available data. This premise has been updated to include the extended resettlement period for the Hmong refugees through February 2008.

CY and BY reflects an increased adjustment for the amount shifted for Recent Non Citizens due to utilization of current and caseload and expenditure data.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The overall caseload and the average monthly persons are projected to decrease by 1.8 percent and 1.7 percent, respectively from CY to BY.

The BY includes the full year savings resulting from Proposition L (San Francisco County's minimum wage increase), which raised San Francisco's minimum wage by an additional fifty cents in January 2006.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly Caseload	431,502	423,690
Average Monthly Persons	1,076,044	1,057,957

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$2,747,031	\$2,708,296
Federal	2,380,774	2,346,817
State	297,581	293,777
County	68,676	67,702
Reimbursements	0	0



***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

# Hurricane Katrina

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of providing benefits and services to victims of Hurricane Katrina who have been relocated to California. Hurricane Katrina hit the Gulf Coast on August 29, 2005, leaving destruction and mass flooding in its wake. Several hundred thousand residents were left homeless, and a federal disaster was declared for portions of Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. States throughout the nation, including California, volunteered to assist with evacuation and relocation efforts.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented September 1, 2005.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

### CalWORKs Grants

- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, it is assumed that 900 evacuee families will be determined eligible for CalWORKs, with the majority establishing eligibility in September 2005. It is assumed that 40 percent of the evacuee families will remain in California indefinitely, and 60 percent will return to their state of origin by the end of the current year (CY).
- For FY 2005-06, the average monthly caseload is assumed to be 707 (17,590 All Other Families [AF] and 2,726 Two-Parent [TP] personmonths), and for FY 2006-07, the average monthly caseload is assumed to be 371 (9,792 AF and 1,518 TP personmonths).
- The AF cost per person is \$226.05 for both the CY and Budget Year (BY). The TP cost per person is \$167.57 for both the CY and the BY.

### CalWORKs Services

- Funding for FY 2005-06 is being held to the November 2005 level.
- An average of 248 cases in the BY are assumed to receive Welfare-To-Work (WTW) services monthly. This represents a caseload increase of 0.14 percent in the BY for CalWORKs Services.
- The base cost for CalWORKs WTW Services is assumed to be approximately \$617 Million in BY.

---

## Hurricane Katrina

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

#### CalWORKs Administration

- Funding for FY 2005-06 is being held to the November 2005 level.
- The average monthly caseload for ongoing administrative activities is 371 in the BY. The cost for continuing activities is \$74.84 per case per quarter.

#### CalWORKs Child Care

- Funding for FY 2005-06 is being held to the November 2005 level.
- For FY 2006-07, the child care utilization rate of 25 percent will be applied to a portion of the cases receiving CalWORKs services.
- The average monthly cost for child care is \$626.28 in the BY, including administration costs.

#### SSI/SSP

- For FY 2005-06, a monthly average of 121 evacuees will receive SSI/SSP grants beginning September 2005. For FY 2006-07, a monthly average of 150 evacuees will receive SSI/SSP.
- It is assumed the SSI/SSP average monthly grant is \$584.83 in CY, including administration costs. The average grant increases to \$615.81 for BY.

#### IHSS

- For FY 2005-06, it is assumed 44 evacuees will receive Personal Care Services Program (PCSP) services beginning October 2005. For FY 2006-07, it is assumed 47 evacuees will receive PCSP services.
- For FY 2005-06, it is assumed the PCSP average monthly grant is \$749.01. For FY 2006-07, it is assumed the PCSP average monthly grant is \$725.10.

#### Food Stamps Administration

- Based on Federal Fiscal Year 2002 CalWORKs Characteristics Survey, 84.80 percent of CalWORKs cases receive Food Stamps.
- It is assumed that the Non-Assistance Food Stamp (NAFS) caseload is 68 percent higher than the Public Assistance Food Stamp (PAFS) cases based on the DFA 256, Food Stamp Program Participation and Benefit Issuance Report for calendar year 2005.
- It is assumed that 40 percent of the Evacuee families will remain in California indefinitely, and 60 percent will return to their state of origin by the end of the CY.
- The average monthly NAFS caseload for ongoing administrative activities is 626 in the CY and 517 in the BY.
- It is assumed that it will cost \$24.28 per case for an Eligibility Worker (EW) to process new food stamp disaster NAFS cases.

---

# Hurricane Katrina

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

### Food Stamps Administration (continued):

- It is assumed that it will cost \$51.00 per case for an EW to process new federal food stamp NAFS cases after 3 months of receiving disaster food stamp benefits.
- It is assumed that it will cost \$33.69 per case for an EW to process federal food stamp NAFS continuing cases on a quarterly basis.
- It is assumed that 7.20 percent of the new cumulative federal food stamp caseload would be subject to mid-quarter reporting.
- It is assumed that it will cost \$28.23 for an EW to process a mid-quarter report for the ongoing federal food stamp NAFS cases.

## METHODOLOGY:

### CalWORKs Grants

- Grant costs are determined by multiplying the personmonths by the cost per person to determine AF and TP basic costs e.g. (BY (9,792 AF personmonths x \$226.05 and 1,518 TP personmonths x \$167.57).

### CalWORKs Services

- CalWORKs services costs are determined by multiplying the basic services costs by the rate of caseload increase for these cases. CY cost is based on five remaining months of the fiscal year. BY cost is based on 12 months.

### CalWORKs Child Care

- Costs are determined by multiplying the caseload by the total cost per case.

### CalWORKs Administration

- Administrative costs are determined by multiplying the ongoing cases by the ongoing quarterly cost per case.

### SSI/SSP

- CY and BY costs are determined by multiplying the number of evacuee recipients by the average monthly SSI/SSP grant and administrative cost per case.

### IHSS

- CY costs are determined by multiplying the number of evacuee recipients by the FY 2005-06 average monthly PCSP grant by 9 months.
- BY costs are determined by multiplying the number of evacuee recipients by the FY 2006-07 average monthly PCSP grant by 12 months.

# Hurricane Katrina

## METHODOLOGY (continued):

### Food Stamps Administration

- The new PAFS eligible cases are calculated by multiplying the CalWORKs eligible families by 84.80 percent.
- The new NAFS eligible cases (1,282 NAFS cases) are calculated by multiplying the number of new PAFS eligible cases by 68 percent, then adding it to the PAFS eligible cases.
- The monthly administrative costs associated with processing the new disaster food stamp NAFS cases are calculated by multiplying the new NAFS cases by \$24.28.
- The monthly administrative costs associated with processing the new federal food stamp NAFS cases after 3 months of receiving disaster food stamp benefits are calculated by multiplying the new NAFS cases by \$51.00.
- The monthly administrative costs associated with processing the mid-quarter changes for the new federal food stamp NAFS cases by multiplying the new cumulative cases by 7.20 percent and by \$28.23.
- The quarterly administrative costs associated with processing the quarterly reports for the new federal food stamp NAFS cases are calculated by multiplying the new cumulative cases by \$33.69 on a quarterly basis.

## FUNDING:

Funding for the CalWORKs grants portion of this premise is shared 84.42 percent TANF, 13.08 percent State General Fund (GF), and 2.5 percent county. Funding for the administrative and services portion of this premise is shared 86.58 percent TANF and 13.42 percent GF. Funding for CalWORKs child care is shared 95 percent federal and 5 percent State. The Food Stamp sharing ratio for the administrative cost/savings is 50 percent federal, 35 percent state, and 15 percent county funds. For IHSS, the Title XIX federal share is 50 percent. The nonfederal share is split 65 percent state, 35 percent county.

## CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

In the CY, the decrease in Grant cost reflects the removed funding for homeless assistance and the revised number of evacuees from 1,000 to 900.

In the CY Food Stamps Administration has decreased based on the determination that Katrina victims are not subject to quarterly or mid-quarter reporting for the first three months. The budget includes eligibility costs associated with shifting cases to the Federal Food Stamps program after three months.

For SSI/SSP, total expenditures increased based on actual evacuee data from the Social Security Administration.

For IHSS, there is no change in CY or BY.

## Hurricane Katrina

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

For CalWORKs grants, the BY decrease reflects the assumption that 60 percent of the eligible families will return to their state of origin by the end of FY 2005-06.

For CalWORKs services, the BY increase reflects the full year cost for those cases that remain in California. For CalWORKs child care, the BY increase reflects a technical adjustment.

For CalWORKs and NAFS Administration, the BY decrease reflects the absence of intake costs and a reduction in the ongoing caseload as families return to their state of origin.

For SSI/SSP, the BY assumes average monthly caseload growth of 29 cases.

For IHSS, the BY assumes caseload will increase by 6.4 percent.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

<b>101 – CalWORKs</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>
<b>Basic Grants</b>		
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$4,595	\$2,900
Federal	3,879	2,448
State	601	379
County	115	73
Reimbursement	0	0

(in 000's)

<b>101 – CalWORKs</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>
<b>Services</b>		
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$361	\$840
Federal	305	727
State	56	113
County	0	0
Reimbursement	0	0

## Hurricane Katrina

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

101 – CalWORKs	2005-06	2006-07
Administration		
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$320	\$117
Federal	270	101
State	50	16
County	0	0
Reimbursement	0	0

101 – CalWORKs	2005-06	2006-07
Child Care		
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$161	\$289
Federal	153	275
State	8	14
County	0	0
Reimbursement	0	0

111-SSI/SSP	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$721	\$1,109
Federal	419	650
State	302	459
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Hurricane Katrina

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

#### 111-IHSS

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$296	\$407
Federal	0	0
State	96	132
County	0	0
Reimbursements	200	275

#### 141-Food Stamp Administration

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$137	\$82
Federal	68	41
State	48	29
County	21	12
Reimbursements	0	0



***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## **Welfare Reform / Work Participation**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the projected impact to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program associated with the implementation of Senate Bill (SB) 1104 (Chapter 229 of Statutes 2004). SB 1104 amended Section 11325.21 of the Welfare and Institutions (W&I) Code to require Universal Engagement for all nonexempt adults. Within 90-days of receipt of aid, all nonexempt adults must sign a Welfare-to-Work (WTW) plan requiring that they work or participate in work-directed services/activities for 20 hours per week, and participate 12-15 hours per week in other activities necessary to obtain employment. Amendments were made to W&I Code section 113228.8 that specify the types of activities that recipients may participate in to satisfy both the work-directed and other activity requirements of the program. SB 68 (Chapter 78, Statutes of 2005) changed the work requirements to allow non-core participation hours, in excess of those that can be accomplished within the 12 or 15 hour requirement, to count toward the core hour requirement.

Work directed (core) activities include subsidized and unsubsidized employment, work experience, on-the-job training, grant based on-the-job training, supported work or transitional employment, work-study, self employment, community service, vocational education and training (for up to twelve months), and job search and job readiness assistance. Other activities (non-core) include adult basic education, general education development, English-as-a-Second-Language, job skills training directly related to employment, education directly related to employment, satisfactory progress in secondary school or in a course of study leading to a certificate or GED, mental health, substance abuse, and domestic violence services, and other activities necessary to assist an individual to obtain unsubsidized employment.

Nonexempt adult recipients in an assistance unit (AU) with one aided adult are required to participate for a minimum of 32 hours per week (20 core/12 non-core). Nonexempt adult recipients in an AU with two aided adults are required to participate for a minimum of 35 hours per week (20 core/15 non-core).

SB 1104 amended W&I Code Section 11454 to eliminate the 18/24 month time limit. Prior to this change, recipients were required to participate in Welfare-to-Work (WTW) activities within an 18/24 month period. An individual's 18/24 month time clock began with the signing of the WTW plan, which occurred after job search when a recipient did not find work. Recipients were required to participate in a variety of activities intended to lead to employment; however, participation in these activities did not first require having a minimum participation requirement in more work-focused activities.

With the elimination of the 18/24 month time limit and the requirement that all nonexempt adults participate in work directed activities within 90 days, the work focus of the CalWORKs Program has been strengthened by placing a greater emphasis on work participation and personal responsibility, while maintaining critical services for needy families.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on December 1, 2004.

## **Welfare Reform / Work Participation**

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing Statute: W&I code section 11325.21.
- Because this estimate assumes implementation of this effort will not begin until July 2006, no grant savings are expected in FY 2005-06.
- Current year (CY) Employment Services costs are held to the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.
- CY Child Care costs are held to the 2005 November Subvention level.

### **Eliminating the 18/24 Month Time Clock**

- Based on WTW 25 data reports, there is an average of 0.57 percent of the total cases in assessment per month.
- Based on the May 2006 projected total CalWORKs caseload used for this estimate (476,293 for the budget year (BY)), and accounting for an accumulating 15 month gradual phase-in (12 months of 1/15), an average of 1,403 cases per month are projected to be in assessment in the BY.
- The average hourly cost for staff to conduct assessment is \$57.57.
- This component assumes one hour of case management time and one-quarter hour of orientation/appraisal time would be saved for each case.

### **Requiring Nonexempt Able-Bodied Adults to Participate in 20+ hours of WtW Activity per Week**

- The Universal Engagement requirement and associated WTW changes authorized under SB 1104 became effective December 1, 2004. SB 1104 established a 90-day period for the development of a WTW plan to engage recipients in the program as quickly as possible.
- This estimate has been updated to assume that most non-exempt cases will be phased-in over a 15-month period, beginning in July 2006.
- The average monthly caseload impacted by this premise has been prorated to account for the 15-month phase in. 75 percent of the impacted caseload should be phased in by the end of the BY. The impact on CalWORKs Child Care and services costs has also been prorated (Child Care assumes a one month delay).
- It is assumed that counties will review WTW plans for any needed modifications at the same time they are performing monthly reviews to ensure that recipients are participating in their assigned activities and complying with other program requirements.
- To determine the projected impacted caseload, cases without an adult (projected Safety Net (46,050 cases), Child Only (165,841 cases), and Sanctioned (50,711 cases)) were excluded. The projected BY impacted caseload is comprised of 213,691 cases (cases with an adult.)

## Welfare Reform / Work Participation

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- Based on the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2004 CalWORKs Characteristics Survey (Q5), this premise assumes that 42 percent of impacted cases (89,302 in the BY) are currently working or participating in work-directed activities. 58 percent of impacted cases (124,390 in the BY) do not currently work or participate in work-directed activities.
- Of the 42 percent of impacted cases participating with program requirements:
  - Based on FFY 2004 Q5 data, 75 percent of the cases currently working or participating in work-directed activities (67,074 cases in the BY) are assumed to be working or participating in allowable activities for 20 or more hours per week. 25 percent of the cases currently working or participating in work-directed activities (22,227 cases in the BY) are assumed to be working or participating less than 20 hours per week.
  - It is assumed that cases working or participating less than 20 hours per week, will increase weekly work or participation hours by an average of 10 hours per week in order to meet the new requirement. Based on FFY 2004 Q5 data, 77 percent of these cases (17,046 in BY) will do so through work. The average grant savings per case is \$145 per month, assuming individuals are paid at minimum wage. The remaining 23 percent (5,181 in BY) will increase their hours of participation through activities other than work.
  - The grant savings achieved through cases working or participating less than 20 hours per week that will increase weekly work hours by an average of 10 hours per week, are offset by grant savings from cases affected by the Pay for Performance (P4P) program (see Pay for Performance premise for further information). P4P affected cases are currently assumed to participate in allowable CalWORKs activities, but only through non-work activities, and would begin to work an average of 10 hours per week due to the P4P program, scheduled to implement in FY 2007-08. Because this group was not working, the "first \$225, then 50%" income disregard formula is applied, generating an average grant savings of \$34 per month.
- Of the 58 percent of impacted cases not participating with program requirements:
  - Based on the average monthly applicant ratio of four percent, there are a projected 19,630 cases in any month in the BY that will have been on CalWORKs less than 60 days, and will not yet be impacted by these changes.
  - Based on WTW 25 data from fiscal year (FY) 2004-05, there are 56,931 cases in the BY with an adult that are not participating in Welfare to Work activities due to "good cause" or exemption. These recipients will not be impacted by these changes.
  - Of the cases not currently working or participating in work-directed activities, it is assumed that five percent each month (6,219 cases in the BY) are "unengaged". These are cases that are not working or participating, and have not yet been identified by the county. These cases will not be impacted by these changes.
  - Of the cases not currently working, it is assumed that approximately 20 percent (24,449 cases in the BY) are in "noncompliance" or "conciliation" status. These cases are not working or participating, but are not yet in sanction status, and therefore no costs or savings are assumed. These cases will not be impacted by these changes.

## Welfare Reform / Work Participation

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- 4,449 cases in the BY that will meet the requirement using blendable non-core activities in accordance with the changes included in SB 68, and will not be impacted by these changes.
- Of the remaining impacted cases not currently working or participating in work-directed activities (12,711 cases), it is assumed that 42 percent (5,312 cases) will participate in work or work-directed activities. Of these cases, 77 percent (4,074 cases) will work 20 or more hours per week. The average grant savings per case is \$180 per month, assuming individuals are paid at minimum wage. The remaining 23 percent (1,238 cases in BY) will increase their hours of participation through approved activities other than work (i.e. community service, mental health services, substance abuse services, on-the-job training (OJT), work experience, education and/or vocational education activities).
- Of the remaining impacted cases not currently working or participating in work-directed activities, it is assumed that 58 percent (7,399 cases) will not meet the 20 hours per week work requirement and will be subject to sanction status.
- Based on information from the "Good Cause Establishment, Compliance, and Curing of Sanctions: CalWORKs Welfare-to-Work Program" report presented to the Legislature in May 2001, an average of 45 percent of the sanctioned caseload "cures." It is assumed that an additional 45 percent of the cases currently not working and facing sanction status will cure and comply with program participation requirements, which is approximately 3,330 cases in the BY.
- Of the cases that cure their sanction status (3,330 cases), 77 percent (2,553 cases) will work an average of 20 hours per week, and 23 percent (776 cases) will comply with program requirements through participation in approved activities other than work.
- Of the cases that will cure, 22 percent will remain in sanction status for one month before curing, and 78 percent will remain in sanction status for two months before curing, resulting in an average monthly grant savings of \$145 in the BY.
- This premise assumes that the remaining 55 percent of the cases subject to sanction (4,070 cases) for non-compliance with participation requirements and will become sanctioned.
- Based on current experience in the CalWORKs program, it is assumed that 24.8 percent of the non-participating cases that will comply with program participation requirements (3,287 x 24.8 percent in the BY) will utilize CalWORKs Child Care.
- Based on current experience in the CalWORKs program, it is assumed that 7.25 percent of the non-participating cases that will comply with program participation requirements will utilize ancillary services. The average cost is \$67.41 per month.
- Based on current experience in the CalWORKs program, it is assumed that 46.88 percent of the non-participating cases that will comply with program participation requirements will utilize transportation services. The average cost is \$64.53 per month.

## Welfare Reform / Work Participation

### METHODOLOGY:

The following methodology was used for the various components to calculate the costs/savings for this premise:

#### **Eliminating the 18/24 Month Time Clock**

- The savings for this component was calculated by projecting a phase-in of the total CalWORKs caseload (476,293 cases) based on an accumulating 15 month implementation (245,394 cases), multiplying by the ratio of monthly cases in assessment, then multiplying the projected cases in assessment by the average cost for staff time, the amount of time saved by eliminating the 18/24 month time clock, and then by the number of impacted months ( $245,394 \times .57 \times 57.57 \times 1.25$  hours  $\times 12 = \$1,211,558$  in the BY).

#### **Requiring Nonexempt Able-Bodied Adults to Participate in 20+ hours of WtW Activity per Week**

- To determine the grant impact of those cases participating under 20 hours per week that would increase the number of hours worked: the number of impacted cases was multiplied by the percentage of participating cases, then by the percentage of those cases participating under 20 hours per week, then by those cases who will meet participation requirements through work to determine the number of participating cases that would be impacted ( $213,691 \times .42 \times .25 \times .77 = 17,046$  cases in the BY).
- Based on assumptions that these cases would need to increase an average of 10 hours of work per week, \$6.75 as the minimum wage, 4.3 weeks per month, with a 15-month phase-in, the average grant savings per case was calculated based on the current CalWORKs disregard rules for earned income ( $17,046$  cases  $\times 10$  hours of work  $\times \$6.75 \times 4.3$  weeks)  $\times 0.5 \times$  accumulating phase-in of  $1/15$  per month = \$12.9 million in grant savings for the BY.
- The \$12.9 million in BY grant savings is offset by \$1.8 million in grant savings achieved through the P4P program for a net total BY grant savings of \$11.1 million.
- The number of cases not participating in work or work-directed activities was determined by multiplying the number of impacted case by the percentage of non participating cases ( $213,691 \times .58 = 124,390$ ).
- To determine the net number of non-participating cases impacted, the number of cases in "unengaged", "good cause", "exempt", "recipient under 60 days", "non-compliance and conciliation", and "blendable non-core (SB68)" categories were subtracted from the "not participating" cases because they will not be impacted by changes in requirements.
- To determine the services impact of those cases not participating that would participate through work or allowable activities other than work on an average of 20 hours per week: the number of net non-participating impacted cases was multiplied by the percentage of participating cases, to determine the number of participating cases that would be impacted ( $12,711 \times .42 = 5,312$  cases in the BY). Child Care, transportation, and ancillary costs are assumed for a portion of these cases.

## Welfare Reform / Work Participation

### METHODOLOGY (continued):

- To determine the grant impact of those cases not participating that would participate through work on an average of 20 hours per week: the number of net non-participating impacted cases was multiplied by the percentage of participating cases, then by those cases who will meet participation requirements through work to determine the number of participating cases that would be impacted ( $12,711 \times .42 \times .77 = 4,074$  cases in the BY).
- Based on assumptions that these cases would need to increase an average of 20 hours of work per week, \$6.75 as the minimum wage, 4.3 weeks per month, with a 15-month phase-in, the average grant savings per case was calculated based on the current CalWORKs disregard rules for earned income ( $(4,074 \text{ cases} \times 20 \text{ hours of work} \times \$6.75 \times 4.3 \text{ weeks}) - \$225$ )  $\times 0.5 \times$  accumulating phase-in of 1/15 per month = \$3.8 million in grant savings for the BY.
- It is assumed the remaining 58% of net impacted non-participating cases (7,399 cases) will not participate and will be subject to sanction status. These cases were multiplied by the average percentage of cases that cure, resulting in 3,330 cases for the BY. Of these cases that will cure, 77 percent will work an average of 20 hours per week and 23 percent will meet program requirements through an average of 20 hours per week in allowable activities other than work.
- To determine the services cost of the cases subject to sanction that will cure by participating, the number of net impacted non-participating cases was multiplied by the percentage of cases that will not participate, then multiplied by the percentage of cases subject to sanction that will cure ( $12,711 \times .58 \times .45 = 3,330$  cases). Child Care, transportation, and ancillary costs are assumed for a portion of these cases.
- To determine the grant impact of the cases subject to sanction that will cure by participating through work, the number of net impacted non-participating cases was multiplied by the percentage of cases that will not participate, then multiplied by the percentage of cases subject to sanction that will cure, and then multiplied by the percentage of cases that participate through work ( $12,711 \times .58 \times .45 \times .77 = 2,553$  cases).
- Based on assumptions that these cases would work an average of 20 hours of work per week, \$6.75 as the minimum wage, 4.3 weeks per month, with a 15-month phase-in, the average grant savings per case was calculated based on the current CalWORKs disregard rules for earned income ( $(2,553 \text{ cases} \times 20 \text{ hours of work} \times \$6.75 \times 4.3 \text{ weeks}) - \$225$ )  $\times 0.5 \times$  accumulating phase-in of 1/15 per month = \$3.2 million in grant savings for the BY. The grant savings for cases that will cure includes grant savings due to sanction (for one or two months) and grant savings resulting from earned income once the sanction is cured.
- The total savings for cases that will not cure is determined by multiplying the projected sanction cases by the average grant savings, and the number of months impacted ( $4,070 \times \$145 \times$  accumulating phase in of 1/15 per month = \$3.1 million savings in the BY).
- Stage One Child Care costs were derived by calculating costs for both the non-working cases who will meet the 20 hours per week work requirement either through employment or by other non-work related activities, and the sanction status cases that will cure.

## Welfare Reform / Work Participation

### METHODOLOGY (continued):

- Total services were determined by adding projected costs for ancillary and transportation services. Ancillary and transportation services costs were determined by multiplying the number of non-participating cases who will now participate, by the ratio of cases who utilize ancillary/transportation services, then by the average monthly costs, then by the appropriate number of months impacted (ancillary services – 8,642 cases x 7.25 percent x \$67.41 per month x accumulating phase in of 1/15 per month; transportation services – 8,642 cases x 46.88 percent x \$64.53 per month x accumulating phase in of 1/15 per month.)
- The new participating cases were multiplied by the percentage that will utilize CalWORKs child care. These cases were then multiplied by the average number of children per case, the average Stage One Child Care payment per child, and then by the appropriate number of months.  $8,642 \text{ cases} \times 0.25 \text{ utilization rate} \times \$626 \times 1.8 \text{ children per case} \times \text{accumulating phase in of } 1/15 \text{ per month} = \$9.4 \text{ million}$  in Stage One Child Care costs for the BY. The Stage One Child Care cost is reduced by approximately \$433,000 and held in the Stage One/Stage Two Holdback. This amount is based on 5 percent of estimated need.

### FUNDING:

The funding for the CalWORKs Program is shared 87.73 percent federal/TANF, 9.77 percent State General Fund (GF) and 2.5 percent county. The funding for child care, transportation, and ancillary costs are shared 91.75 percent federal/TANF and 8.25 percent State General Fund. The State share reflects the GF cost for the State-Only Two-Parent Program that implemented October 1, 1999. The State-Only Two-Parent Program is countable toward the State's maintenance of effort.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The elimination of grant savings in the CY is based on a revised implementation schedule due to a delay in the promulgation of regulations. Decreases in the BY for grant savings, employment services and child care are due to updated data, changes in methodology and a revised implementation schedule.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in net savings and decrease in employment services and child care are due to updated data, changes in methodology, and a revised implementation schedule.



## Welfare Reform / Work Participation

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

<b>101 – CalWORKs Basic Grants</b>	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	0	-\$21,233
Federal	0	-18,628
State	0	-2,074
County	0	-531
Reimbursement	0	0

(in 000's)

<b>101 – CalWORKs Services &amp; Admin</b>	2005-06	2006-07
	Services	Services
Total	\$11,369	\$431
Federal	10,227	395
State	1,142	36
County	0	0
Reimbursement	0	0

<b>101 – CalWORKs Stage One Child Care<sup>1</sup></b>	2005-06	2006-07 <sup>1</sup>
	Services	Services
Total	\$865	\$9,447
Federal	865	8,668
State	0	780
County	0	0
Reimbursement	0	0

## Welfare Reform / Work Participation

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

NET TOTAL	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$12,234	-\$11,355
Federal	11,092	-9,566
State	1,142	-1,258
County	0	-531
Reimbursement	0	0

<sup>1</sup> For FY 2006-07, these figures reflect the additional Stage One Child Care costs associated with SB 1104, prior to the 5 percent holdback (see Child Care Stage One/Two Five percent Holdback Premise).

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## **Guillen v. Schwarzenegger** **(October 2003 COLA)**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the impact of the Guillen v. Schwarzenegger court case that involves the suspension of the October 2003 cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to the maximum aid payment (MAP). The court ruled against the State, and the Administration has subsequently appealed this decision. This appeal is still pending.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise was to implement on October 1, 2003.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 11453.
- The 3.46 percent COLA to be given on October 1, 2003, has been suspended.
- The State is appealing the court's decision in this case, and has filed a motion of stay pending further litigation.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

No costs were budgeted for this premise due to the decision to suspend the COLA.

### **FUNDING:**

There is no funding for this premise due to the decision to suspend the COLA.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

There is no change pending the appellate court's decision.

### **EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Maximum Aid Payment – July 2005 COLA

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of adding a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to the maximum aid payment (MAP). The COLA is based on the changes determined by the Department of Finance in the California Necessities Index (CNI), which are the weighted average changes for food, clothing, fuel, utilities, rent and transportation for low-income consumers. In accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 11453 the effective date of the COLA is July 1 of each year.

As part of the 2005 Budget Act, Senate Bill (SB) 68 (Chapter 78, Statutes of 2005) eliminated the Fiscal Year 2005-06 COLA. Due to the delayed passage of the budget, a one-month COLA has been issued for the month of July 2005 only.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2005.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC section 11453.
- The 4.07 percent COLA will be effective for the month of July 2005 only.
- Federal Fiscal Year 2004 Q5 Survey data was used to determine the average All Other Families (AF) and Two Parent (TP) grants before and after the 4.07 percent COLA increase.
- The average increase in the AF basic grant due to the July 2005 COLA is \$24.74 (4.4 percent); the average increase in the TP basic grant is \$33.60 (5.2 percent). These ratio increases were also applied to all of the other affected premises.

### METHODOLOGY:

The July 2005 4.07 percent increase for the AF and TP average grants was determined by dividing the value of the COLA increase by the value of the average grant prior to the July 2005 COLA. This percent was then multiplied by the affected month's (July 2005 only) basic persons costs for AF and TP in the current year. The result was the COLA impact on the basic AF and TP persons costs. These AF and TP costs were then totaled. The impact to other affected premises was determined by a similar calculation.

### FUNDING:

The State General Fund (GF) share reflects the cost of the State-Only Two-Parent and Safety Net programs. For the current year, the funding is shared 81.5 percent Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, 16.0 percent GF, and 2.5 percent county. The State-Only Two-Parent and Safety Net programs are countable toward the State's maintenance of effort.

## Maximum Aid Payment – July 2005 COLA

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The impact of the one month 4.07 percent COLA is now reflected in the basic CalWORKs trend.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There are no costs in the budget year. The 4.07 percent COLA has been eliminated beyond July 2005.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Maximum Aid Payment – July 2006 COLA

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of adding a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to the maximum aid payment (MAP). The COLA is based on the changes determined by the Department of Finance in the California Necessities Index (CNI), which are the weighted average changes for food, clothing, fuel, utilities, rent and transportation for low-income consumers. In accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 11453 the effective date of the COLA is July 1 of each year.

As part of the 2005 Budget Act, Senate Bill (SB) 68 (Chapter 78, Statutes of 2005) eliminated the Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07 COLA.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was not implemented.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC section 11453.
- Senate Bill (SB) 68 (Chapter 78, Statutes of 2005) eliminated the FY 2006-07 COLA.

### METHODOLOGY:

No costs were budgeted for this premise due to the decision to eliminate the COLA.

### FUNDING:

There is no funding for this premise due to the decision to eliminate the COLA.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

No change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

No change.



## Maximum Aid Payment – July 2006 COLA

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Pay for Performance

### DESCRIPTION:

Pay for Performance is an investment strategy to encourage counties to achieve critical CalWORKs program outcomes. The original proposal established a three-year pilot project to ensure that counties invest resources in activities that are most effective and efficient in achieving the desired outcomes.

Subject to an appropriation, payments for the Pay for Performance program were scheduled to begin in FY 2006-07. However, funds have not been set aside for appropriation in FY 2006-07 and the program has been delayed. This is because recent legislative requirements under SB 1104 have not yet achieved the desired outcomes and budgeted savings, and the revised implementation of SB 1104 has been delayed until July 2006 (see the Welfare Reform premise for more information). These legislative changes were assumed to make substantial changes to the number of employed recipients, thereby effecting grant savings.

However beginning in FY 2007-08, the Department will begin measuring and publishing county performance outcomes. A total of \$40 million is held in the FY 2006-07 TANF Reserve to fund incentives in FY 2007-08 for those counties who meet or exceed program outcome goals. County performance will be evaluated based on the following outcome measures:

- Employment rate of county CalWORKs cases.
- Modified federal participation rate that accounts for State allowable activities of county CalWORKs cases.
- Percentage of county CalWORKs cases that have earned income three months after ceasing to receive assistance.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2005.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Due to the delay in implementation of this program, there is no CY effect.
- \$40 million is currently in the FY 2006-07 TANF Reserve to fund incentive payments to counties in FY 2007-08 that meet or exceed performance outcome goals.

### CalWORKs Grant Savings

- CalWORKs grant savings will be achieved in the BY as participants successfully increase employment and increase earnings.

## Pay for Performance

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

#### Increased TANF Participation

- This estimate assumes that 4,338 cases in the BY that are meeting CalWORKs participation requirements through activities other than employment, will begin working an average ten hours per week.
- For these cases, ten hours of work per week will result in average monthly grant savings of \$34 per month, based on the minimum wage of \$6.75 per hour and the current disregard rules for earned income.
- No additional child care or services costs are assumed for these cases that are already participating in Welfare-to-Work activities.

### FUNDING:

The funding for the CalWORKs Grant Savings is shared 87.73 percent federal/TANF, 9.77 percent State General Fund (GF) and 2.5 percent county.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

Grant savings in CY have been removed due to the delay in implementation of this program. Decreased grant savings in the BY are due to the delay in implementation of this program.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Due to the delay in implementation of this program, there are no grant savings in the CY.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

101 – CalWORKs Basic Grants	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	0	- \$1,757
Federal	0	- \$1,541
State	0	- \$172
County	0	- \$44
Reimbursement	0	0

## AFDC Collections

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the federal share of Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) overpayments that occurred before October 1, 1996. The United States Department of Health and Human Services issued Program Instruction (PI) TANF-ACF-PI-2000-2 on September 1, 2000, clarifying current federal policy and requirements regarding overpayment recovery and reimbursement of the federal share. AFDC overpayments collected will increase the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) expenditures by the amount recognized.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2001.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The federal Office of Inspector General (OIG) conducted audits in San Bernardino, San Diego and Los Angeles counties to determine how much California must repay for the period of October 1996 through June 30, 2001. The audits identified a total of \$34.4 million in federal AFDC collections for the three counties, which has already been repaid to the Federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS).
- The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) worked with the OIG to develop a methodology to determine the amount of remaining AFDC collections made by the counties not previously audited by the OIG. The methodology identified that CDSS owes the Federal government an additional \$52.8 million for the remainder of the Federal share of AFDC overpayments recovered by the State from December 1, 1996 through June 30, 2006.
- CDSS received a letter from the Federal DHHS on May 1, 2006 requesting that the Department refund the amount due within 30 days.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The November Subvention included \$1.7 million for the amount of overpayment collections for FY 2005-06. In addition to this amount \$28.2 million has been shifted from the CY TANF reserve. The remaining balance owed has been accounted for in prior year budgets.

### FUNDING:

The funding for this premise is 100 percent TANF.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The remaining balance due to the Federal Government for AFDC Overpayment Collections from the period December 1, 1996 through June 30, 2006 will be paid in the CY.

## AFDC Collections

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

All AFDC collections will be collected and repaid by June 30, 2006.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$29,858	\$0
Federal	29,858	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Tribal TANF**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the State General Fund (GF) cost to operate tribal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Programs in California. Assembly Bill 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) allowed GF to be provided for tribes to administer a Tribal TANF Program. The Department has established a memorandum of understanding with the California Tribal TANF Partnership (CTTP) that represents the tribal members in Amador, Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Glenn, Humboldt, Lake, Lassen, Modoc, Napa, Plumas, Solano, Sutter, Trinity, and Yuba counties; Hoopa that represents tribal members in Humboldt; North Fork Rancheria (NFR) that represents the tribal members in Madera, Mariposa, and Merced; Owens Valley Career Development Center (OVCDC) that represents the tribal members in Fresno, Inyo, Kern, Kings, and Tulare counties, and Tule Reservation; the Southern California Tribal Chairman Association (SCTCA) that represents tribal members in Santa Barbara and San Diego counties; the Torres-Martinez Tribal TANF (TMTT) that represents tribal members in Los Angeles and Riverside counties; and the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California (WTNC) that represents tribal members in Alpine, Alameda, El Dorado, Nevada, Placer, Sacramento, San Francisco, San Joaquin, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Santa Cruz counties.

Federal welfare reform legislation allows for each Indian tribe that has an approved Tribal Family Assistance Plan to receive a Tribal Family Assistance Grant based on Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1994 actual expenditures. The administrative authority to operate a TANF Program is transferred to the tribes, together with federal and state funding based on FFY 1994 levels. Transferred funds include monies to meet grant costs and administrative costs related to cash aid and Welfare to Work (WTW) services. The GF costs are based on the estimated participation rates of reimbursement for the counties, during FFY 1994, in which the tribal organizations are located.

Pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 1104, state funding for existing tribal TANF programs will be based on actual program caseloads, including assistance and service only cases effective July 1, 2005. The state funding will not exceed the original state share designated for the tribal TANF program in the original negotiation of 1994 caseload counts. Those programs that have received funding for less than three years will not have their state funding adjusted.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

- The original CTTP tribes implemented in July 2003. CTTP Phase II consisting of tribes in Amador, Butte, Colusa, Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Modoc, and Trinity counties implemented in July 2004. CTTP Phase III in Contra Costa, San Joaquin, Calaveras, Mendocino, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sonoma, Tehama, and Yolo counties pending federal approval were expected to implement in March 2006.
- The original Hoopa tribe in Humboldt implemented in October 2004.
- The Morongo Band of Mission Indians in Riverside County pending approval of the Memorandum of Understanding between the tribe and CDSS was expected to implement in March 2005.
- The original tribes in NFR implemented in August 2003.

## **Tribal TANF**

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE (continued):**

- The original OVCD tribes in Inyo and Kern implemented in May 2001 and October 2001 respectively. The OVCD tribe expansion in Tule River Reservation and Tulare County implemented in July 2002. Additional OVCD tribes in Fresno and Kings Counties implemented in January 2004 and Mono and Ventura counties pending federal approval were expected to implement in March 2006.
- The original SCTCA tribes implemented in March 1998. Seventeen additional tribes in San Diego County implemented in May 1999. Another tribal expansion in San Diego County pending federal approval was expected to implement in March 2006.
- The Soboba Band of Luiseno Indians in Riverside County implemented in October 2005.
- The original TMTT tribes in Los Angeles and Riverside County implemented in May 2001. The TMTT tribal service area expansion in nine additional cities in Riverside implemented in April 2002. Additional TMTT tribes in Orange and San Bernardino counties pending federal approval are expected to implement in July 2006.
- The original Washoe tribes implemented in January 2003. Washoe Phase II implemented in July 2005. Washoe Phase III consists of tribes within the State of Nevada. CDSS is waiting to receive the federal data request letter regarding Washoe IV. Washoe Phase V consisting of Monterey, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, and Marin counties pending federal approval was expected to implement in March 2006.
- The Yurok tribes in Del Norte and Humboldt counties pending federal approval were expected to implement in March 2006.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10553.2(d).
  - The following average monthly cost per case/person were used to determine the GF and TANF costs, and were based on the average expenditure amount per case/person for FFY 1994:
    - ♦ The average monthly cash aid cost of \$211.34 per person is based on the average cash aid expenditure amount per person for FFY 1994;
    - ♦ The average persons per case is 2.9;
    - ♦ The WTW services utilization rate of 7.7118 percent was applied to the number of cash aid cases to determine the number of WTW service participants for tribes;
    - ♦ The average monthly WTW services cost per person is \$206.36;
    - ♦ The average monthly WTW services cost was derived by dividing the Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN) Program expenditures for FFY 1994 (less child care) by the number of active GAIN participants.
    - ♦ The average monthly administrative cost per case is \$50.73.
  - The average number of cases/persons that are used to calculate GF Costs are based on the following:
-

## **Tribal TANF**

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):**

- ◆ Effective FY 2005-06, the GF provided to the Tribes entering their 4<sup>th</sup> year will be based on the lesser of the highest quarter of the most recent four quarters of caseload plus 10 percent projected caseload growth or the 1994 data. Tribes that will be entering their 5<sup>th</sup> or subsequent years will be the lesser of the average quarter of the most recent four quarters of caseload plus 10 percent projected caseload growth or the 1994 data
- ◆ Tribes that have implemented less than three years will be based on FFY 1994 data;
- ◆ The average monthly number of cash aid cases are 11,679 in the current year and 14,892 in budget year;
- ◆ The average monthly number of WTW services participants is 3,145 in the current year and 9,121 in the budget year.
- The average number of cases/persons that are used to calculate TANF Costs are based on the following:
  - ◆ FFY 1994 data;
  - ◆ The average monthly number of cash aid cases are 16,919 in the current year and 23,108 in budget year; and
  - ◆ The average monthly number of persons receiving WTW services is 1,653 in the current year and 2,173 in the budget year.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

TANF transferred directly to the tribes and the state participation rates for FFY 1994 are calculated as follows:

- The grant costs were derived by multiplying the average number of persons per case by the number of cases to determine the total number of persons. The total number of persons was then multiplied by the cash aid cost per person.
- The WTW services costs were derived by multiplying average monthly number of persons receiving WTW services by the average monthly WTW services cost per person.
- The administrative costs were derived by multiplying the average number of cash aid cases by the average monthly administrative cost per case.

### **FUNDING:**

The GF amount will be counted toward the State's maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement. The GF share of grant costs is 47.5 percent. The GF share of administrative and WTW services costs is based on the applicable state percentage that was reimbursed during FFY 1994 in those counties in which the tribal organizations are located. The counties are not funding their normal 2.5 percent share of grant costs or their MOE share of the costs. The direct distribution of TANF funds to the tribal organizations reduces both the TANF block grant available to the State and the State's MOE requirement. The State's MOE has been reduced in the same proportion as the reduction in the block grant.



## Tribal TANF

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year costs were updated to reflect revised implementation dates, cases, tribal expansions, and a new caseload methodology for over 3-year old tribes used in determining the Tribal Family Assistance Grant.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year costs reflect full-year costs for tribes that implemented in part of the current year.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06			2006-07		
	Grant	County Admin.	WTW Services	Grant	County Admin.	WTW Services
Total						
	\$40,845	\$2,662	\$2,878	\$52,083	\$3,446	\$8,616
Federal <sup>1</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0
State						
	40,845	2,662	2,878	52,083	3,446	8,616
County	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0	0	0	0	0

<sup>1</sup> The federal share of the above costs was deducted from the TANF block grant to show the transfer of funds to the tribal organizations, a total of \$69.4 million in FY 2005-06 and \$94.7 million in FY 2006-07.

## Prospective Budgeting

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the administrative savings, grant/coupon costs, one-time training costs, and reprogramming costs associated with implementing a quarterly reporting system using prospective budgeting in determining benefits based on projected income over a three-month period for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs), Food Stamps (FS), California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) and Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) programs.

Assembly Bill (AB) 444 (Chapter 1022, Statutes of 2002) requires the replacement of the current monthly reporting/retrospective budgeting system with a Quarterly Reporting/Prospective Budgeting (QR/PB) system for the CalWORKs Program. This bill also requires the State to adopt the QR/PB system in the FS Program to the extent permitted by federal law, regulations, waivers and directives. The Code of Federal Regulations (7 CFR) section 273.21 requires states to determine food stamp eligibility using either a prospective or retrospective budgeting methodology consistent with the State's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program unless a waiver is granted by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Food and Nutrition Services (FNS).

Under the QR/PB system, recipients' eligibility and benefits for a three-month period will be based on information provided on the Quarterly Eligibility Report Form (QR 7) and will be determined using prospective budgeting and income averaging rules. Recipients will have mandatory mid-quarter reporting requirements during the quarter. All CalWORKs recipients with earnings are required to report; income that exceeds the Income Reporting Threshold (IRT) which is the greater of the CalWORKs eligibility limit, or 130 percent of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL) for the family size; drug felony convictions; fleeing felon status; parole/probation violations; and address changes. FS recipients will only be required to report address changes in mid-quarter. Certain nonassistance FS (NAFS) recipients will also be required to report changes in work hours that could affect eligibility. Recipients have the option to report changes that would result in increased grant/coupon benefits when they occur. To determine whether the change results in increased benefits mid-quarter, currently reported income and reasonably expected income for the rest of the quarter will be averaged for the current and the remaining months and subsequent benefits are adjusted accordingly.

Households that are currently not required to submit monthly reports may have their benefits determined on either a prospective or retrospective basis at the State agency's option, unless specifically excluded from retrospective budgeting.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The implementation period for this premise ran from November 1, 2003, through June 30, 2004.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: 7 CFR section 273.21(b), and Welfare and Institutions Code sections 11265.1-11265.3 and 11450.1-11450.3.
- The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) has received USDA-FNS waiver approval to implement QR/PB for the FS Program.

## Prospective Budgeting

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- Implementation months varied by county (November 2003, January 2004, March 2004, April 2004, May 2004, and June 2004).
- The funding for CalWORKS/RCA administration in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.
- The May 2006 Revise caseloads for CalWORKs, NAFS, CFAP and the RCA programs are used to project the number of cases that will be impacted by QR/PB reporting each month.
- The current year (CY) grant costs and NAFS/CFAP Administrative costs are based on 5,735,569 CalWORKs casemonths; 5,241,611 NAFS caseonths; 16,836 RCA casemonths 95,054 CFAP casemonths.
- The budget year (BY) costs and savings are based on 5,715,519 CalWORKs casemonths; 5,757,022 NAFS casemonths; 16,356 RCA casemonths; and 99,996 CFAP casemonths.
- It is assumed that 10.4 percent of the total NAFS/CFAP cases are currently subject to nonmonthly/change reporting based on the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2002 FS Characteristics Survey. The nonmonthly/change reporting months are 4,696,483 NAFS cases and 85,168 CFAP cases in CY; and 5,158,292 NAFS cases and 89,596 CFAP cases in the BY.
- The continuing case cost under monthly reporting was \$42.75 per month per case and for NAFS was \$25.01 per month per case based on actual caseload and expenditure data.
- The CalWORKs eligibility worker cost per hour is \$57.57.
- Based on county time study data collected during October and November 2005, the amount of time needed for CalWORKs continuing case activities under QR/PB is 78 minutes per quarter at a cost of \$74.84 per case.
- Based on county time study data collected during October and November 2005, the amount of time needed to process CalWORKs mid-quarter activities averages nine minutes per month per case at a cost of \$8.63 per case
- The NAFS/CFAP continuing case activities under QR/PB are estimated to cost \$33.69 per case per quarter.
- It is assumed that it will cost \$28.23 per case to process a mid-quarter change for NAFS/CFAP cases.
- Mid-quarter administrative activities for CalWORKs and NAFS/CFAP cases include voluntary and mandatory mid-quarter reporting, and county initiated contact. CalWORKs mid-quarter activities also includes IRT reporting.

## Prospective Budgeting

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- The current cost for mailing a monthly report form to a recipient is \$0.78. It is assumed that the cost for mailing the quarterly report will be \$0.78 per household/case.
- It is assumed that only one-third (33 percent) of the total CalWORKs, NAFS, CFAP, and RCA cases will report each month under the QR/PB framework. The remaining two-thirds (67 percent) of the cases will only report outside their normal quarterly report month in certain circumstances.
- Based on the CalWORKs Report on Reasons for Discontinuances of Cash Grant, (CA 253 CW), 8.73 percent of the CalWORKs cases are discontinued each month, and 12.39 percent of the cases are discontinued due to income exceeding CalWORKs eligibility limits. Under QR/PB some of these cases will experience a delay in being discontinued until their quarterly report month.
- CalWORKs recipients with unearned income only will be exempt from mid-quarter reporting when their income exceeds the IRT. This group of recipients accounts for 0.06 percent of the CalWORKs caseload. It is assumed that 50 percent of these cases will receive one month of additional benefits and 50 percent will receive two months of additional benefits before being discontinued when their quarterly report is filed.
- Due to the difference in income level between the CalWORKs eligibility limit and the IRT, it is assumed that 40.04 percent of the CalWORKs cases currently discontinued due to excess earned income, excluding two-person cases, will not be required to report during mid-quarter months due to their income being under 130 percent of the FPL based on the FFY 2002 CalWORKs Characteristics Survey, and FFY 2002 Employment Development Department (EDD) wage data. It is assumed that 50 percent of these cases will receive one month of additional benefits and 50 percent will receive two months of additional benefits before being discontinued when a quarterly report is filed.
- The number of CalWORKs cases required to report income exceeding the IRT during mid-quarter months is estimated at 0.16 percent of the total caseload implemented.
- Based on data from the Fraud Investigation Activity Report (DPA 266) for Calendar Year 2005, fraud cases account for 2.23 percent of total CalWORKs cases. Fifty percent of the cases will result in an overpayment for one month and 50 percent of the cases will result in a two-month overpayment. Based on fraud overpayment collection experience, it is assumed that 50 percent of the overpayments will be recovered after a six-month period.

## Prospective Budgeting

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- Based on EDD wage data, the average CalWORKs case receives a grant of \$206.50 and the average CFAP household receives a benefit of \$85.00 just prior to becoming ineligible due to excess income.
- Based on a county survey data regarding Reduced Income Supplemental Payments (RISPs) application, it is estimated that 2.72 percent of the total caseload will have decreased earnings and will report the decrease during the non-quarterly report months.
- Under QR/PB, CalWORKs recipients will receive a grant adjustment equal to 100 percent of the grant increase associated with reported decrease in income. Under monthly reporting rules recipients may receive supplemental payments equal to 80 percent of the grant increase. The average CalWORKs grant impact for cases that would report decreased income in non-quarterly report months is estimated at \$116.67.
- CFAP cases will receive a 100 percent supplemental payment equal to the increase; under monthly reporting these cases do not receive a supplemental payment. The average CFAP benefit impact for cases that would report decreased income in non-quarterly report months is \$53.03.
- Based on the CA 253 Reports, 1.06 percent of CalWORKs and CFAP monthly cases would become ineligible for the following reasons: no eligible child (0.90 percent); excess resources (0.06 percent); or no deprivation (0.10 percent). It is assumed that 50 percent of these cases will continue to receive one additional full month of the grant and 50 percent will continue to receive two additional months of the full grant before being discontinued.
- Based on data from the CA 253 Reports, 4.73 percent of CalWORKs and CFAP cases were discontinued each month for not submitting a Monthly Eligibility Report (CW 7) under the monthly reporting system. It is assumed that 28 percent of these cases now delay discontinuance for one or two months under the quarterly reporting system. It is assumed that 50 percent of the remaining cases will continue to receive one additional full month of grant and 50 percent will continue to receive two additional full months of grant before being discontinued.
- The average CalWORKs grant per case is \$540.35 based on the CA 800 CalWORKs expenditure reports for the period of January through June 2005. The average CFAP benefit per case is \$210.60 based on Calendar Year 2005 DFA 256 Reports.
- Based on Refugee Services Program Services Participation and Outcomes Report (RS 50) data, 1.26 percent of the current RCA cases are terminated due to employment, and 0.45 percent of the cases have their grant reduced due to employment.
- Based on the most recent actual RCA expenditures, the average grant per case for RCA is \$299.72 in the CY and BY. The average grant for RCA cases just prior to exiting the program is estimated at \$114.54.

## Prospective Budgeting

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- Based on the FS Program Monthly Caseload Movement Statistical Report (DFA 296) for FY 2003-04, 14.73 percent of CFAP cases are discontinued each month. It is estimated that 12.39 percent of the cases are discontinued due to income exceeding eligibility limits. It is assumed that 41.9 percent of these cases will not be discontinued until their quarterly report month; therefore, resulting in 50 percent of the cases receiving one month of additional benefits and 50 percent receiving two months of additional benefits.
- The costs and savings under the QR/PB framework are compared to the monthly reporting and retrospective budgeting framework. Assuming one-third of the income increases occur in each month, the result is one month of costs, one month of savings and one month of no cost or savings to CalWORKs or CFAP programs. The net impact is zero in those cases with increased income of all ranges not reporting.
- Based on a county survey data, 4.47 percent of the NAFS/CFAP caseload will report change of address, change in household composition, or shelter cost, that will result in mid-quarter administrative activity. An additional .65 percent of the NAFS/caseload will be subject to a county initiated action during mid-quarter months.
- Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents (ABAWDS) are required to report during the quarter when they are not meeting the work requirement. Based on the Stat 47, Food Stamp Program Work Registrant, ABAWD, and Food Stamp Employment and Training (FSET) Program Caseload Report, for calendar year 2005, 0.16 percent of the monthly NAFS/CFAP caseload for non-waiver counties (2,754,392 in FY 2005-06 and 3,025,233 in FY 2006-07) experiencing a reduction in work hours causing them to become ineligible for the FS Program.

## METHODOLOGY:

### Administration

- The CalWORKs, NAFS, CFAP and RCA prospective budgeting administrative costs are calculated by adding the administrative costs to process the following: quarterly reports and mid-quarter changes.
- For BY, the CalWORKs and RCA administrative savings associated with continuing case activities under monthly reporting are calculated by multiplying the monthly continuing case cost by the total casemonths (e.g., for CalWORKs:  $\$42.75 \times 5,715,519$ )).
- For BY, the CalWORKs and RCA administrative costs associated with continuing case activities under quarterly reporting/prospective budgeting are calculated by multiplying the quarterly continuing case cost by the casemonths of those required to report on a quarterly basis (e.g., for CalWORKs:  $\$74.84 \times 5,715,519 \times 33$  percent)).
- For BY, the CalWORKs and RCA administrative costs to process mid-quarter changes are calculated by multiplying the casemonths by the cost per month (e.g., for CalWORKs:  $(5,715,519 \times \$8.63)$ )).

## Prospective Budgeting

### METHODOLOGY (continued):

- The NAFS and CFAP administrative savings from not processing monthly reports are calculated by multiplying the monthly cost to process a continuing case by the total casemonths (e.g., for NAFS:  $(\$25.01 \times 4,696,483)$ ).
- The NAFS and CFAP administrative costs to process quarterly reports are calculated by multiplying the quarterly cost to process a continuing case by the casemonths of those required to report on a quarterly basis (e.g., for NAFS:  $(\$33.69 \times 4,696,483 \times 33 \text{ percent})$ ).
- The NAFS and CFAP administrative costs to process a change resulting in reduced earnings are calculated by multiplying the number of cases that would report their reduced earnings outside the quarterly reporting months by the cost per case (e.g., for NAFS:  $(4,696,483 \times 2.72 \text{ percent} \times \$28.23)$ ).
- The NAFS and CFAP administrative costs to process a change of address during non-quarterly report months are calculated by multiplying the number of cases that would report the changes outside the quarterly reporting months by the cost per case (e.g., for NAFS:  $(4,696,483 \times 1.64 \text{ percent} \times \$28.23)$ ).
- The NAFS, and CFAP administrative costs to process a change in household composition or shelter costs that will result in increased benefits are calculated by multiplying the number of cases that would report the changes outside the quarterly reporting months by the cost per case (e.g., for NAFS:  $(4,696,483 \times 2.83 \text{ percent} \times \$28.23)$ ).
- The NAFS, and CFAP administrative costs to process a county initiated actions is calculated by multiplying the number of cases that would report the changes outside the quarterly reporting months by the cost per case (e.g., for NAFS:  $(4,696,483 \times .65 \text{ percent} \times \$28.23)$ ).
- The administrative cost to process discontinuances for ABAWDs not meeting the work requirement is calculated by multiplying the number of cases that would report outside the quarterly report month and are not exempted from the ABAWD waivers by the cost per case (e.g., for NAFS:  $(2,754,392 \times 0.16 \text{ percent} \times \$28.23)$ ).
- The CalWORKs, NAFS, CFAP and RCA administrative cost to mail quarterly reports is calculated by multiplying the annual casemonths by one-third to determine the number of cases in a quarter; then multiplying by the mailing cost (e.g., for NAFS:  $(5,158,292 \times 33 \text{ percent} \times \$0.78 \text{ cents})$ , for CalWORKs:  $(5,715,519 \times 33 \text{ percent} \times \$0.78 \text{ cents})$ ). Mailing costs for mid quarter reports are determined based on the monthly number of mid quarter reports  $\times \$0.78$ .
- The CalWORKs, NAFS, CFAP and RCA administrative savings due to not mailing monthly reports is calculated by multiplying the number of cases reporting monthly by the mailing cost (e.g., for NAFS:  $(4,696,482 \times \$0.78)$ , for CalWORKs:  $(5,715,519 \times \$0.78)$ ). To allow for counties to transition to the new system, it is assumed that the counties realize 11 percent of the potential monthly savings upon implementation, with a continual 11 percent increase until 100 percent of the potential monthly savings is achieved in the ninth month of phase-in.

## Prospective Budgeting

### METHODOLOGY (continued):

#### Grants/Benefits

- CalWORKs grant and CFAP coupon costs for not processing CW 7 noncompliance cases monthly are calculated by multiplying the average monthly grant/coupon per case by the impacted casemonths, accounting for the assumption that 50 percent receive one month of additional grant and 50 percent receive two months of additional grant (e.g., for CalWORKs FY 2005-06:  $(\$540.35 \times 77,289 \times 50 \text{ percent}) + (\$540.35 \times 77,289 \times 50 \text{ percent} \times 2)$ ).
- CalWORKs grant and CFAP coupon costs for not discontinuing ineligible cases (for reasons of no eligible child, etc.) until the quarterly report month are calculated by multiplying the monthly average grant/coupon per case by the impacted casemonths, accounting for the assumption that 50 percent receive one month of additional grant and 50 percent receive two months of additional grant (e.g., for CalWORKs FY 2005-06:  $(\$540.35 \times 29 \times 50 \text{ percent}) + (\$540.35 \times 29 \times 50 \text{ percent} \times 2)$ ).
- RCA grant costs for not adjusting cases with increased earnings until the monthly report month are calculated by multiplying the impacted casemonths by the monthly average reduction in grants of \$114.54 (RCA statewide:  $49 \times \$114.54$ ).
- CalWORKs grant costs for not discontinuing cases with income over the CalWORKs eligibility limit but under the IRT are calculated by multiplying the impacted casemonths by the average grant per case accounting for the assumption that 50 percent receive one month of additional grant and 50 percent receive two months of additional grant (e.g., for CalWORKs:  $(\$206.50 \times 2,549 \times 50 \text{ percent}) + (\$206.50 \times 2,549 \times 50 \text{ percent} \times 2)$ ).
- CalWORKs grant costs for those cases exempt from reporting when their income exceeds the IRT because they have unearned income only, are calculated by multiplying the impacted casemonths by the associated average grant per case, accounting for the assumption that 50 percent receive one month of additional grant and 50 percent receive two months of additional grant (e.g., for CalWORKs FY 2005-06:  $(\$206.50 \times 2,267 \times 50 \text{ percent}) + (\$206.50 \times 2,267 \times 50 \text{ percent} \times 2)$ ).
- CalWORKs grant costs for increasing the benefits of those cases reporting a decrease in income during mid-quarter months are calculated by multiplying the impacted casemonths by the average grant increase of \$118.92 (e.g., for CalWORKs FY 2005-06:  $(\$116.67 \times 155,832 \times 50 \text{ percent}) + (\$116.67 \times 155,832 \times 50 \text{ percent} \times 2)$ ).
- Overpayments for those cases that will not report income exceeding the IRT are calculated by multiplying the average grant per case by the impacted casemonths of those that will not report, accounting for the assumption that 50 percent receive one month of additional grant and 50 percent receive two months of additional grant, and 50 percent of the overpayments will be recovered after a six-month period (e.g., for CalWORKs FY 2005-06:  $(\$206.50 \times 205 \times 50 \text{ percent}) + (\$206.50 \times 205 \times 50 \text{ percent} \times 2)$ ).
- CFAP coupon costs for not discontinuing cases with income over the eligibility limit are calculated by multiplying the impacted casemonths by the average grant per case accounting for the assumption that 50 percent receive one month of additional grant and 50 percent receive two months of additional grant (e.g., for CFAP:  $(\$85.00 \times 21 \times 50 \text{ percent}) + (\$85.00 \times 21 \times 50 \text{ percent} \times 2)$ ).



## Prospective Budgeting

### METHODOLOGY (continued):

- CFAP coupon costs for those cases reporting a decrease in income during mid-quarter months are calculated by multiplying the impacted casemonths by the average coupon increase (e.g., for CFAP:  $(\$53.03 \times 2,317) + (\$53.03 \times 2,317 \times 50 \text{ percent})$ ).

### FUNDING:

The funding for CalWORKs grants is 82.34 percent TANF, 15.16 percent State General Fund (GF) and 2.5 percent county. Funding for CalWORKs Administration is 83.76 percent TANF and 16.24 percent GF. The FS sharing ratio is 50 percent federal, 35 percent state, and 15 percent county funds. CFAP costs are 100 percent GF. RCA costs are funded 100 percent federal funds.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The CY and BY decrease to CalWORKs grant costs reflects a reduction in the number of cases. The CY CalWORKs administration funding is held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level. The BY CalWORKs administrative savings reflects the impact of the county time study data which resulted in an increase in cost per case for continuing and midquarter activities. The decrease in savings for NAFS administration is due to a decline in caseload. The CFAP benefit and administration decrease reflects a decrease in caseload.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY CalWORKs grant costs reflects a decrease in the projected caseload. The BY CFAP benefits reflect an increase in projected caseload. The BY CalWORKs administrative savings reflects the impact of the county time study data which resulted in an increase in cost per case for continuing and midquarter activities. The BY savings for NAFS and CFAP administration reflects an increase in caseload.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEM 101 – CalWORKs Grant/ Administration	2005-06		2006-07	
	Grant	Admin.	Grant	Admin.
Total	\$91,988	-\$126,186	\$91,667	-\$55,367
Federal	75,743	-113,512	75,478	-46,378
State	13,945	-12,674	13,897	-8,989
County	2,300	0	2,292	0
Reimbursements	0	0	0	0

## Prospective Budgeting

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

ITEM 141 – Food Stamp Administration	2005-06	2006-07
	Admin.	Admin.
Total	-\$56,916	-\$62,454
Federal	-28,458	-31,227
State	-19,921	-21,859
County	-8,537	-9,368
Reimbursements	0	0

ITEM 101 – CFAP ITEM 141- CFAP Administration	2005-06		2006-07	
	Grant	Admin.	Grant	Admin.
Total	\$842	-\$1,046	\$886	-\$1,101
Federal	0	0	0	0
State	842	-1,046	886	-1,101
County	0	0	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0	0	0

ITEM 101 – RCA ITEM 141 - RCA Administration	2005-06		2006-07	
	Grant	Admin.	Grant	Admin.
Total	\$9	-\$372	\$9	-\$144
Federal	9	-372	9	-144
State	0	0	0	0
County	0	0	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Recent Noncitizen Entrants

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of continuing to aid Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNEs). The federal Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA), Public Law 104-193, excluded most legal immigrants entering the United States (U.S.) after the date of enactment (August 22, 1996). These RNEs to the United States are barred from receiving benefits from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program for the first five years they are in the country. PRWORA does provide exceptions for certain noncitizens:

1. Refugees, asylees, or those granted withholding of deportation for their first five years in the U.S.;
2. Veterans, current military personnel, spouses and dependents; and,
3. Cuban-Haitian noncitizens: Cuban-Haitian entrants are eligible for Refugee Assistance and Refugee Education Assistance.

The California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program continued aid to certain groups of noncitizens that became ineligible with the implementation of PRWORA. These include: (1) Parolees; (2) Conditional Entrants; (3) Legal Permanent Residents; (4) Permanently Residing in the United States Under Color of Law; and, (5) Battered Noncitizens.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in September 1996.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Based on the most recent information from the Summary Report of Assistance Expenditures for CalWORKs – Legal Immigrants (CA 800 M and CA 800), the projected average monthly persons is 25,574 for CY and 24,816 for BY.
- Projected persons are estimated to decrease 3.73 percent in CY and 1.78 percent in BY.
- Based on recent expenditure and caseload data reports from July to November 2005 on the Summary Report of Assistance Expenditures for CalWORKs – Legal Immigrants (CA 800M and CA 800) the average grant per person was \$141.72.
- The administrative costs for RNEs claimed by counties were \$10,229,312 during FY 2004-05.
- The percentage of persons that are TANF eligible is 40.36 percent.
- For services, the costs in FY 2005-06 are being held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level. The services costs in FY 2006-07 reflect 1.8 percent of the CalWORKs Services Basic cost. Of the 1.8 percent, \$5.4 million are TANF eligible and are shifted to the CalWORKs Basic premise. Refer to that premise for more detailed information regarding services. The percentage is based upon actual expenditures from Calendar Year 2005.

## Recent Noncitizen Entrants

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS: (continued)

- For CalWORKs Child Care, the total costs for FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 is 1.0 percent of the CalWORKs Stage One Child Care cost. Refer to that premise for more detailed information regarding child care. The percentage is based upon actual expenditures from Calendar Year 2004 for FY 2005-06 and Calendar Year 2005 for FY 2006-07.
- For Cal Learn, the costs in FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 reflect 1.5 percent of the Cal Learn cost. Refer to that premise for more detailed information regarding Cal Learn. The percentage is based upon actual expenditures from Calendar Year 2005.
- The funds associated with persons that are TANF eligible are reflected in the Basic Program.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The grant costs were calculated by multiplying the projected monthly recipients by the average grant per person.
- The administrative cost was calculated based on actual expenditures adjusted for projected caseload decline. Of the total administrative cost, 40.36 percent represent cost for federal households and remains in the CalWORKs basic Administration, funded with General Fund.
- The child care costs for the Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNEs) is 1.0 percent based on Stage One expenditures from Calendar Year 2005. Of this 1 percent, 40.36 percent represent federal households and remains in the Stage One Basic Program, funded with General Fund. The remaining portion of RNEs is reflected in this premise.
- The Cal Learn costs are a shift of 1.5 percent of the total estimated cost to RNEs.
- The services costs for the RNEs are 1.8 percent based on the CalWORKs Services expenditures from Calendar Year 2005. Of this 1.8 percent, 40.36 percent represent federal households and remains in CalWORKs Basic, funded with General Fund. The remaining portion of RNEs is reflected in this premise.

### FUNDING:

The grant costs are funded with 95 percent State General Fund (GF) and 5 percent county funds. The administrative costs, employment services and child care are 100 percent GF. Child Care is 100 percent GF. The total funding is countable toward the State's TANF maintenance of effort requirement.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

Grant cost reflects an increase due to an update of statistical information that reflects current caseload and expenditure data.

Child Care costs reflect updated caseload and expenditure data.

There is no change to Cal Learn.

## Recent Noncitizen Entrants

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Grants and Administration reflects a decrease in caseload. The Services increase reflects an increase in caseload. The Cal Learn increase reflects caseload growth. The Child Care decrease reflects a decrease in caseload and cost per child.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEM 101 -		2005-06		2006-07	
CalWORKs Assistance Payments		Grant	County Admin.	Grant	County Admin.
Total		\$42,621	\$6,006	\$42,258	\$5,768
Federal		0	0	0	0
State		40,490	6,006	40,145	5,768
County		2,131	0	2,113	0
Reimbursements		0	0	0	0

(in 000's)

ITEM 101 -		2005-06		2006-07	
CalWORKs Services		County Admin.		County Admin.	
Total		\$6,590		\$7,950	
Federal		0		0	
State		6,590		7,950	
County		0		0	
Reimbursements		0		0	

## Recent Noncitizen Entrants

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

ITEM 101 -	2005-06	2006-07
<b>CalWORKs Stage</b>	Services/	Services/
<b>One Child Care</b>	Administration	Administration
Total	\$2,840	\$2,314
Federal	0	0
State	2,840	2,314
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

ITEM 101 -	2005-06	2006-07
<b>Cal Learn Services</b>	Services/	Services/
	Administration	Administration
Total	\$245	\$249
Federal	0	0
State	245	249
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Employment Training Fund

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the Employment Training Fund (ETF) amount used to offset the cost of providing employment services to recipients of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program.

ETF funds are derived from employer contributions and administered by the Employment Development Department. The ETF funds meet the federal criteria to be counted toward Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program maintenance of effort (MOE) requirements.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was originally implemented on July 11, 1994. No funding was appropriated for Fiscal Year (FY) 1997-98 through FY 1998-99. The premise was re-implemented on July 1, 1999.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

It is assumed \$37.9 million will be available in FY 2005-06 and \$32.9 million in FY 2006-07 from the ETF.

### METHODOLOGY:

Once the total cost of providing CalWORKs employment services is calculated, the cost is reduced by the amount of the ETF appropriated to the California Department of Social Services by the Legislature.

### FUNDING:

This premise is funded with ETF funds, which are MOE countable.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Budget Year has been updated to reflect the availability of ETF funds.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	-\$37,930	-\$32,930
Federal	0	0
State	-37,930	-32,930
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0



***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

# California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program Basic

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of providing employment and training services to Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program households. As a result of Public Law 104-193, the federal welfare reform legislation established the TANF Program. Assembly Bill (AB) 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) mandates the implementation of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program. The employment services provided to CalWORKs recipients include a wide variety of activities designed to assist the recipient in obtaining and retaining employment.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 15204.3(a) amended by AB 1111 and Senate Bill 1104.
- The estimate in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is being held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.
- The FY 2006-07 base funding for CalWORKs Services Basic was \$749.1 million.
- The caseload is projected to decrease 1.7 percent in FY 2006-07.
- It is assumed that 67 percent of the CalWORKs eligible adults associated with the recent influx of Hmong refugees will receive employment services, based on actual employment services experiences. This equates to a .02 percent increase for FY 2006-07.
- Projected staff development costs for FY 2006-07 are \$4.1 million, based on Calendar Year 2005 actual expenditures.
- Contract costs are projected to be \$3.9 million for FY 2006-07, based on FY 2004-05 actual expenditures.
- The Wagner-Peyser reimbursement amount is \$2.7 million for FY 2006-07.
- In FY 2006-07, 1.8 percent of the CalWORKs Services Basic expenditures are for Recent Noncitizens Entrants (RNE). Of the 1.8 percent, \$7.9 million are TANF ineligible and are shifted to a separate premise. The remainder represents households with Federal and nonfederal eligible recipients and are funded with state only dollars.
- Time limit savings are \$166,651,000 in FY 2006-07.
- In FY 2006-07 RNE for Cal Learn are funded with state only dollars in the amount of \$165,252.

## METHODOLOGY:

### FY 2006-07

- The basic funding from FY 2005-06 is adjusted to reflect caseload decline, staff development expenditures, contract costs and the Wagner-Peyser reimbursement. Funds for TANF ineligible RNE were subtracted and shifted to the RNE premise.

## California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program Basic

### FUNDING:

The State share reflects the cost for the following: the State-Only Two-Parent Program (6.02 percent) and RNE (\$5.4 million) for TANF eligible persons in mixed RNE households. The State share for these programs are countable toward the State's maintenance of effort requirement. The federal TANF share reflects the cost for all other families receiving employment services.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The FY 2006-07 estimate is adjusted due to a decrease in the projected caseload and an increase in time limits savings.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The FY 2006-07 estimate reflects a decrease in the projected caseload and an increase in time limits savings.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$621,115	\$567,428
Federal	589,499	540,498
State	31,616	26,930
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Single Allocation Adjustment

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects an adjustment to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Single Allocation for Fiscal Years (FY) 2005-06 and 2006-07. Section 15204.3 of the Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) is amended to include provisions for this adjustment.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2002.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: W&IC section 15204.3.

### METHODOLOGY:

For FY's 2005-06 and 2006-07 the funding was held to the FY 2004-05 level.

### FUNDING:

The State share reflects the cost for the State-Only Two-Parent Program that implemented October 1, 1999. The State-Only Two-Parent Program is countable toward the State's maintenance of effort requirement.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The State only two-parent percentage increased from 5.84 percent to 6.0 percent.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$191,892	\$191,892
Federal	180,686	180,379
State	11,206	11,513
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## **Participation Improvement Project**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Participation Improvement Project. This project will help counties overcome barriers in engaging CalWORKs recipients in appropriate activities and improving counties' ability to meet the federal work participation rate.

Beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07, this project will provide grants to counties to target specific populations that are impacting the county's ability to meet the federal work participation requirements. The type of issues this project is intended to address include strategies for addressing unengaged recipients, reducing counties high sanction and non-compliance rates to engage recipients in the welfare-to-work program, or reducing the number of recipients who are able to participate but are not continuously engaged.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise will implement July 1, 2006.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- An amount of \$20 million is budgeted in FY 2006/07 to fund grants to counties for the purpose of targeting specific populations that are impacting their ability to meet the federal work participation requirements.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

- An amount of \$20 million is budgeted in FY 2006/07 to fund grants to counties for the purpose of targeting specific populations that are impacting their ability to meet the federal work participation requirements.

### **FUNDING:**

The funds are 100 percent TANF.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

This is a new premise.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

This premise will implement in the budget year.

## Participation Improvement Project

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

101 – CalWORKs	2005-06	2006-07
<b>Services</b>		
Total	\$0	\$20,000
Federal	0	20,000
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursement	0	0

## CalWORKs Safety Net Program

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of continued assistance and services for the Safety Net Program. The California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program provides that individuals may receive CalWORKs assistance funds for a lifetime maximum of 60 months. In accordance with Welfare and Institutions (W&I) Code Section 11320.15, adult participants that have received aid for a total of 60 months shall be removed from the assistance unit for the purpose of calculating aid. However, Assembly Bill 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) allows counties to provide aid to the children until they are 18 years of age and job retention services to former recipients for up to 12 months after leaving aid. In addition, former recipients that are working or participating in an approved Welfare-To-Work activity after leaving aid are eligible for up to two years of transitional child care.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2003.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing Statute: W&I Code Sections 11320.15, 11450.13 and 11454.5.
- Individuals began reaching their CalWORKs 60-month time limit in January 2003.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 the data sources used to determine the impacted caseload were the CA 237 for grants, WTW 25/25A for services and the CW 115/115A for child care.
- The CalWORKs Services, Administration, and Stage One Child Care funding in FY 2005-06 is being held at the Budget Act of 2005 level.
  - The cases reaching the CalWORKs 60-month time limit in the current year (CY) and budget year (BY) are 85 percent All Families cases (one-parent cases) and 15 percent two-parent cases.
  - The average grant for a Safety Net case is calculated using the most recent actual data reported on the CA 800 and the CA 237. The average Safety Net grant is \$505.
- Statutory language requires that the Safety Net Grant shall equal the Maximum Aid Payment, adjusted to reflect the removal of the adult or adults from the assistance unit (AU) and further adjusted by the net nonexempt income of the adult or adults removed from the AU.
- In FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07, 478,896 and 552,594 casemonths, respectively, will be eligible for the Safety Net.
- Administrative costs for the Safety Net cases are assumed to remain at the same level as before removal of the adult(s).
- The percentage of Safety Net cases to the total CalWORKs caseload minus the two-parent is 10.0 percent in FY 2006-07.
- The cases that reach the time limit and are working will receive 24 months transitional child care and one year of job retention services.



---

## CalWORKs Safety Net Program

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- The average monthly number of cases that will receive Safety Net employment services is 1,729 in FY 2006-07.
- The monthly cost of providing Safety Net employment services in FY 2006-07 is \$382 per case based on the cases reported on the WTW 25/25A Reports and the County Expense Claim for Safety Net employment services for FY 2004-05.
- For FY 2006-07, the projected monthly Stage One caseload is 2,346 based on actual safety net cases reported on the CW 115/115A for Calendar Year 2005.
- The monthly cost of Stage One Safety Net is \$266 per child. This is based on actual safety net expenditures and caseload from FY 2004-05 as reported on the county expense claims and the CW 115 and CW 115A reports.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The Safety Net grant costs are calculated by multiplying the total Safety Net casemonths by the cost per case ( $552,594 \times \$505$ ).
- The Employment Services Safety Net costs are calculated by multiplying the number of Safety Net cases receiving services by the monthly cost to provide services ( $1,729 \times 12 \times \$382$ ).
- The shift in administrative costs from CalWORKs to the Safety Net was calculated by applying the percentage of Safety Net cases to the total CalWORKs administration costs with adjustments for related premises.
- The Stage One Child Care Safety Net costs are calculated by multiplying the caseload by the cost per child. The total cost for FY 2006-07 is \$7.5 million.

### FUNDING:

The "Safety Net" for employment services, administration, and child care is 100 percent State General Fund (GF)/Maintenance of Effort. The "Safety Net" for CalWORKs grants is shared 97.5 percent GF and 2.5 percent county funds.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

Safety Net grant cost reflects an increase in CY and BY due to updated caseload and expenditure with increased caseload.

Safety Net services costs reflects an increase in BY due to an increase in average cost per case.

Stage One Child Care Safety Net costs decreased in BY due to a revised methodology for determining caseload and cost per child.

## CalWORKs Safety Net Program

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The CalWORKs administration increase reflects an increase in Safety Net cases. The grant and services increase reflects an increase in average cost per case. The Stage One Child Care decrease reflects a decrease in Safety Net cases, based on actual data.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEM 101 -		2005-06		2006-07	
CalWORKs Assistance Payments		Grant	County Admin.	Grant	County Admin.
Total		\$242,067	\$29,427	\$278,874	\$34,688
Federal		0	0	0	0
State		236,015	29,427	271,902	34,688
County		6,052	0	6,972	0
Reimbursements		0	0	0	0

ITEM 101 -		2005-06		2006-07	
CalWORKs Services		Services		Services	
Total		\$7,414		\$7,916	
Federal		0		0	
State		7,414		7,916	
County		0		0	
Reimbursements		0		0	

## CalWORKs Safety Net Program

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

ITEM 101 -	2005-06	2006-07
CalWORKs Stage	Services/Admin	Services/Admin
One Child Care <sup>1</sup>	.	.
Total	\$34,462	\$7,476
Federal	0	0
State	34,462	7,476
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

<sup>1</sup> - Refer to the "CalWORKs Child Care Fund Transfer to CDE for Stage Two as CCDBG" premise description for more information regarding the cost of the Safety Net in Stage Two.

## Substance Abuse Services

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide for the treatment of substance abuse for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program Welfare to Work participants. Assembly Bill (AB) 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) mandated the implementation of the CalWORKs Program. In addition, it mandates, to the extent that funding is available, that counties provide for the treatment of substance abuse that may limit or impair a participant's ability to make the transition from welfare to work or retain employment over a long period of time. The county welfare departments and the county alcohol and drug departments are required to collaborate to ensure an effective system is available to provide evaluations and substance abuse treatment.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11322.6.
- The funding in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is being held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.
- The projected average monthly caseload is 2,173 in FY 2006-07. The FY 2006-07 caseload is based on a six month linear regression and projection from January 2005 through December 2005.
- The cost per case is \$1,846 in FY 2006-07.

### METHODOLOGY:

The projected average monthly caseload is multiplied by the projected cost per case.

### FUNDING:

The funding for this premise is 100 percent State General Fund and is countable toward the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families maintenance of effort requirement.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

This premise has been updated to reflect updated caseload and expenditure data.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease in budget year reflects an increase in caseload, offset by a decline in cost per case.

## Substance Abuse Services

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$48,870	\$48,125
Federal	0	0
State	48,870	48,125
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Mental Health Services

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise provides for the treatment of mental or emotional difficulties for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program Welfare to Work participants. Assembly Bill (AB) 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) mandated the implementation of the CalWORKs Program. In addition, it mandates, to the extent that funding is available, that counties provide for the treatment of mental or emotional difficulties that may limit or impair a participant's ability to make the transition from welfare to work or retain employment over a long period of time.

Available mental health services must include assessment, case management, and treatment and rehabilitation services.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: AB 1542.
- The funding in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is being held at the Budget Act of 2005 level.
- The projected average monthly caseload is 7,379 in FY 2006-07. The FY 2006-07 caseload is based on a six month linear regression and projection from January 2005 through December 2005.
- The cost per case is \$709 in FY 2006-07.

### METHODOLOGY:

The projected caseload is multiplied by the projected cost per case.

### FUNDING:

The funding for this premise is 100 percent State General Fund and is countable toward the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families maintenance of effort requirement.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

This premise has been updated to reflect updated caseload and expenditure data.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in budget year is the net result of a decrease in caseload and increase in average cost per case.

## Mental Health Services

### PENDITURES:

(in 000's)

---

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$59,916	\$62,777
Federal	0	0
State	59,916	62,777
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Mental Health/Substance Abuse Services for Indian Health Clinics**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the cost to provide mental health and/or substance abuse services to Native Americans by providing a clinician in each of the 36 Indian health clinics. Services provided are necessary to obtain or retain employment, or to participate in county or Tribal Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) welfare-to-work (WTW) activities.

The services may include: (a) outreach and identification of individuals who are receiving, or may be eligible for, California's Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program assistance; (b) screening of individuals for substance abuse or mental health issues; (c) ensuring that individuals have transportation to the county welfare department (CWD) to apply for CalWORKs and/or to participate in WTW activities; (d) accompanying individuals to the evaluation for mental health and/or substance abuse services; (e) providing individual or group services, or making referrals to more intensive treatment services offered by the CWD; and, (f) facilitating the integration of individuals into the CalWORKs WTW Program.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

Twenty-seven clinics implemented this program on Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02. Nine additional clinics implemented in FY 2002-03.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11322.6.
- The Legislature has appropriated \$2.1 million to services for Indian health clinics.
- The budget year funding is held to the current year level.

### **FUNDING:**

This premise is funded with 100 percent State General Fund, which is countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort requirement. The funds will be distributed through an interagency agreement with the Department of Alcohol and Drug Program for allocation to the Indian health clinics.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

There is no change.



## **Mental Health/Substance Abuse Services for Indian Health Clinics**

### **EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$2,100	\$2,100
Federal	0	0
State	2,100	2,100
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## County Performance Incentives

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs to provide fiscal incentive payments to counties for case exits due to employment, grant reductions due to earnings, and the diversion of applicants, as specified by the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) legislation, Assembly Bill (AB) 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997), and AB 2876 (Chapter 108, Statutes of 2000). The counties would receive an annual performance incentive allocation starting from Fiscal Year (FY) 1997-98, subject to the amounts appropriated in the annual Budget Act. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) began advancing incentive payments to the counties, as they were earned, but prior to their expenditure. The incentive allocations to counties were to be used for specific purposes for either the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program or the CalWORKs Program.

In 2001, the United States Department of Health and Human Services advised CDSS that the advancement of performance incentives was inconsistent with the federal Cash Management Improvement Act regulations, and that the unexpended funds must be recouped for redistribution. By June 30, 2002, CDSS had recouped the unspent performance incentive funds from the counties in accordance with the federal Cash Management Improvement Act. In view of the pressures to California's TANF block grant in FY 2002-03 and beyond, the Department used part of the recoupment to fund the CalWORKs Program in FY 2002-03. The remainder of the recouped funding was allocated to the counties in FY 2003-04. Unexpended funds as of June 30, 2004, are available in the current year and the budget year.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing Statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 10544.1 and 10544.2.
- Section 10544.2 provides that incentive funds shall be available for encumbrance and expenditure by counties without regard to fiscal year until all funds are expended. After the supplemental claims, the unexpended performance incentive balance was \$101.7 million as reflected in the FY2005-06 TANF Performance Incentives allocation.
- Pursuant to an agreement with the County Welfare Director's Association (CWDA) unspent performance incentives were considered in the methodology for distribution in the FY 2005-06 CalWORKs single allocation.
- The balance of performance incentives not used in FY 2005-06 is available to counties in FY 2006-07.

### METHODOLOGY:

The available fiscal incentives for FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 are based on the unexpended balance as of FY 2004-05.

### FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent TANF block grant funds.

## County Performance Incentives

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year reflects the balance of anticipated unspent funds.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06 <sup>1</sup>	2006-07 <sup>1</sup>
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$61,720	\$40,000
Federal	61,720	\$40,000
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

<sup>1</sup> — The current and budget year amounts represent unspent funding which was appropriated in FY 2003-04, and is a non-add item in the Detail Tables.

## Effect of EDD Wagner-Peyser Reimbursement

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of the Wagner-Peyser funds provided by the State Employment Development Department (EDD) to offset the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program. As required in Assembly Bill 2580 (Chapter 1025, Statutes of 1985), 50 percent of the available federal Wagner-Peyser funds are directed to provide for job services required for CalWORKs Program activities.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This is an ongoing premise based on an annual appropriation.

### METHODOLOGY:

Funding amounts are identified and provided by EDD.

### FUNDING:

The EDD receives the federal funds for this program and transfers a portion to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) as a funding source for the CalWORKs Program. The availability of these federal funds reduces CDSS' cost of the CalWORKs Program.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$2,735	\$2,735
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	2,735	2,735

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## TANF Pass-Through for State Agencies

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program block grant funds to other state agencies that provide employment and educational services to California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Welfare To Work (WTW) Program participants.

These state agencies are the California Community Colleges (CCC), the California Department of Education (CDE), and the California Department of Health Services (DHS).

The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges (COCCC) pass-through is for the purpose of reimbursing COCCC for the federal share of costs of educational services provided to participants of the WTW Program. The CDE pass-through is for the purpose of reimbursing CDE for the federal share of costs of average daily attendance hours, including CalWORKs WTW hours that exceed each school district's cap. The DHS pass-through is for Community Challenge Grant projects aimed at reducing adolescent and unwed pregnancies and fatherlessness by linking community-based organizations, schools, health educators, social service providers, parents, and youths.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1992. Beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 1997-98, these contracts were funded under TANF rather than with Title IV-F funds.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The contracted amounts of TANF funds provided to other agencies are:

	<u>FY 2005-06</u>		<u>FY 2006-07</u>
COCCC -	\$ 8.39 million	CCC -	\$ 8.39 million
CDE -	\$ 9.98 million	CDE -	\$ 9.98 million
DHS -	\$20.00 million	DHS -	\$20.00 million

### METHODOLOGY:

The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) entered into interagency agreements that specify the amounts of TANF funds to be transferred from CDSS to the contracting departments.

### FUNDING:

The COCCC and CDE pass-through are funded with 89 percent TANF and 11 percent State General Fund. The DHS contract is funded with 100 percent TANF.

---

## TANF Pass-Through for State Agencies

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$38,374	\$38,374
Federal	36,353	36,353
State	2,021	2,021
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Employment Retention and Advancement Services Grant

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the federal Employment Retention and Advancement Services (ERAS) grant funds available to Los Angeles and Riverside counties. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) applied for the ERAS grant on behalf of these counties. These grant funds will be used primarily for county personnel to travel to and from Washington, D.C. The funds may also be used for salaries, wages, and benefits. CDSS entered into contracts with the two counties to pass-through the funds. The counties each received \$100,000 annually for five years, during the evaluation phase.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1998.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The Riverside County grant for the project expired in Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05.
- The Los Angeles County grant for the project expired on October 31, 2005.

### FUNDING:

The evaluation phase is 100 percent federally funded.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

In FY 2006-07, Los Angeles County did not renew the agreement.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$26	\$0
Federal	26	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursement	0	0



***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Cal Learn

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of providing intensive case management, supportive services, and fiscal incentives and disincentives to eligible teen recipients who are pregnant or parenting and participating in the Cal Learn Program. The Cal Learn Program was authorized by Senate Bill (SB) 35 (Chapter 69, Statutes of 1993) and SB 1078 (Chapter 1252, Statutes of 1993). Assembly Bill 2772 (Chapter 902, Statutes of 1998) changed the status of the Cal Learn Program from a five-year federal demonstration project to a permanent program.

The program provides services to encourage teen parents to stay in high school or an equivalent program and earn a diploma. Case management activities must meet the standards and scope of the Adolescent Family Life Program. Those standards include case management activities such as arrangement and management of supportive services, development and review of the report card schedule, exemption and deferral recommendations, and recommendations for bonuses and sanctions.

This premise includes the identification of cases, initial informing notices, and referrals to orientation. Also included is the administrative time to process the supportive services payment and the county mandated activities performed by the county welfare department. Those required activities include the final determination of deferrals, exemptions, bonuses and sanctions, good cause determinations and activities associated with fair hearings.

Effective March 31, 1999, the federal waivers for the Cal Learn Program expired. Without the waiver authority, the sanctioned Cal Learn teen parents are not Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program-eligible. This sanctioned caseload is funded with State General Fund (GF).

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on April 1, 1994.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11331.7.
- The projected average monthly caseload for Cal Learn Bonuses and Sanctioned Grants is 7,655 and 7,535 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and FY 2006-07, respectively.
- The funding for FY 2005-06 for Services and Administration has been held at the Budget Act of 2005 level and based on the following key data/assumptions:
  - ◆ The estimate assumes that 8,140 of the CalWORKs Program caseload are pregnant or parenting teens in the Cal Learn Program. This caseload is based on applying a linear regression to the actual Cal Learn caseload as reported for FY 2004-05 on the monthly Stat 45 Reports and projected through June 2006. The Cal Learn Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNE) grant costs are displayed in a separate premise.
  - ◆ The sanctioned caseload of 513 represents 6.3 percent of the projected Cal Learn caseload. This is based on the actual sanctioned caseload compared to the total Cal Learn caseload as reported on the monthly Stat 45 Reports from July 2004 through June 2005.

## Cal Learn

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- ◆ The case management cost was calculated at \$2,405 per case per year for all activities performed by the case manager. The rate is based on actual FY 2004-05 case management expenditures divided by the total Cal Learn caseload.
- ◆ The administrative and services costs for sanctioned cases (315) are \$1,002,813 based on the utilization rate of 3.9 percent for the State Only Cal Learn expenditures for FY 2004-05 and the projected Cal Learn caseload for the current fiscal year.
- ◆ The RNE caseload of 122 represents 1.5 percent of the projected Cal Learn caseload. This is based on the actual recent noncitizen entrants caseload compared to the total Cal Learn caseload as reported on the monthly Stat 45 Reports from July 2004 through June 2005. A portion of the funding for RNE was shifted to CalWORKs Services Basic associated with persons in mixed cases that are TANF eligible.
- ◆ The hourly eligibility worker (EW) cost is \$57.57.
- ◆ The incentives are a \$100 bonus per report card period for satisfactory progress and a \$500 bonus upon graduation. The disincentive is a \$100 sanction per report card period for failure to submit a report card or to make adequate progress.
- ◆ The sanctioned grant cost is \$484 per month. These rates are based on the Maximum Aid Payment for an Assistance Unit with two people minus the \$100 sanction.
- ◆ The estimate assumes that 16.4 percent of the total Cal Learn caseload will utilize transportation services at a cost of \$28.74 per month per participant. The utilization rate is based on the FY 2004-05 caseload, as reported on the monthly Stat 45 Reports. The cost is based on the FY 2004-05 county transportation expenditure claims.
- ◆ The estimate assumes that 2.5 percent of the total Cal Learn caseload will utilize ancillary services at a cost of \$103.74 per month per participant. The utilization rate is based on the FY 2004-05 caseload as reported on the monthly Stat 45 Reports. The cost is based on the FY 2004-05 county ancillary expenditure claims.
- ◆ The estimate assumes that the Cal Learn participants' success rate for the \$100 bonus is 5.5 percent, the rate for the \$500 bonus is 1.2 percent, and the rate for the \$100 sanction is 6.3 percent. The rates are based on the actual FY 2004-05 caseload as reported on the monthly Stat 45 Reports.
- ◆ Subsidized child care is available for Cal Learn participants attending high school. Please refer to the "CalWORKs Child Care - Stage One Services and Administration" premise for the assumptions and methodology used to develop the estimate.
- The funding for FY 2006-07 for Services and Administration costs were held at the Budget Act of 2005 level and are based on the following key data/assumptions:
  - ◆ The estimate assumes that 8,294 of the CalWORKs Program caseload are pregnant or parenting teens in the Cal Learn Program. This caseload is based on applying a linear regression to the actual Cal Learn caseload as reported for Calendar Year 2005 on the monthly Stat 45 Reports and projected through June 2007. The Cal Learn Recent Noncitizen Entrants grant costs are displayed in a separate premise.

## Cal Learn

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- ◆ The sanctioned caseload of 523 represents 6.3 percent of the projected Cal Learn caseload. This is based on the actual sanctioned caseload compared to the total Cal Learn caseload as reported on the monthly Stat 45 Reports from FY 2004-05.
- ◆ The case management cost was calculated at \$2,405 per case per year for all activities performed by the case manager. The rate is based on FY 2004-05 case management expenditures divided by the total Cal Learn caseload.
- ◆ The administrative and services costs for sanctioned cases (321) are \$1,021,913 based on the utilization rate of 3.9 percent for the State Only Cal Learn expenditures for FY 2004-05 and the projected Cal Learn caseload for the budget year.
- ◆ The recent noncitizen entrants caseload of 124 represents 1.5 percent of the projected Cal Learn caseload. This is based on the actual recent noncitizen entrants caseload compared to the total Cal Learn caseload as reported on the monthly Stat 45 Reports from FY 2004-05. A portion of the funding for RNC was shifted to CalWORKs Services Basic associated with persons in mixed cases that are TANF eligible.
- ◆ The hourly eligibility worker (EW) cost is \$57.57.
- ◆ The incentives are a \$100 bonus per report card period for satisfactory progress and a \$500 bonus upon graduation. The disincentive is a \$100 sanction per report card period for failure to submit a report card or to make adequate progress.
- ◆ The sanctioned grant cost is \$511 per month. These rates are based on the Maximum Aid Payment (MAP) for an Assistance Unit with two people minus the \$100 sanction.
- ◆ The estimate assumes that 16.4 percent of the total Cal Learn caseload will utilize transportation services at a cost of \$28.74 per month per participant. The utilization rate is based on the FY 2004-05 caseload as reported on the monthly Stat 45 Reports. The cost is based on the FY 2004-05 county transportation expenditure claims.
- ◆ The estimate assumes that 2.5 percent of the total Cal Learn caseload will utilize ancillary services at a cost of \$103.74 per month per participant. The utilization rate is based on the FY 2004-05 caseload as reported on the monthly Stat 45 Reports. The cost is based on the FY 2004-05 county ancillary expenditure claims.
- ◆ The estimate assumes that the Cal Learn participants' success rate for the \$100 bonus is 5.5 percent, the rate for the \$500 bonus is 1.2 percent, and the rate for the \$100 sanction is 6.3 percent. The rates are based on the actual FY 2004-05 caseload as reported on the Stat 45 Reports.
- ◆ Subsidized child care is available for Cal Learn participants attending high school. Please refer to the "CalWORKs Child Care - Stage One Services and Administration" premise for the assumptions and methodology used to develop the estimate.

### METHODOLOGY:

- For FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07, the case management cost was multiplied by the projected Cal Learn caseload, adjusted by removing sanctioned and RNE cases, for each fiscal year to determine the annual cost.

---

## Cal Learn

### **METHODOLOGY (continued):**

- The EW cost per hour was multiplied by the adjusted average monthly Cal Learn caseload, and then multiplied by 12 months to determine the annual county administration cost.
- The caseload methodology for the FY 2005-06 Estimate was changed to include teen parents with Cal Learn status during the month. In prior years, teen parents were counted only if they carried forward to the next month. Teen parents who became exempt, or discontinued during the month, were not counted in caseload calculations.
- The transportation cost was determined by multiplying the adjusted Cal Learn caseload by the transportation utilization rate, multiplied by the transportation cost per case, and then multiplied by 12 months to determine the annual cost in the current year and budget year.
- The ancillary service cost was determined by multiplying the adjusted Cal Learn caseload by the ancillary utilization rate, multiplied by ancillary cost per case, and then multiplied by 12 months to determine the annual cost in the current year and the budget year.
- The rates for the \$100 and \$500 bonuses were each multiplied by the total caseload, then multiplied by 12 to determine the annual costs for the current year and the budget year. The 1.5 percent of bonuses related to RNE cases are then backed out and displayed in a separate premise.
- The State-only (sanctioned) rate was multiplied by the total caseload to determine the sanctioned caseload, multiplied by the Maximum Aid Payment for Assistance Unit to determine the sanctioned grant costs in the current year and budget year.
- The RNE caseload rate was multiplied by the total caseload to determine the RNE Cal Learn caseload, which is multiplied by the EW cost per hour, multiplied by 12 months to determine the annual RNE Cal Learn administrative costs for the current year and the budget year. The RNE Cal Learn caseload is multiplied by the case management cost per case to determine the annual RNE Cal Learn case management costs for the current year and the budget year. A portion of the funding for RNE was shifted to CalWORKs Services Basic associated with persons in mixed cases that are TANF eligible.

### **FUNDING:**

Cal Learn costs are 100 percent TANF, except for the grants and services for the sanctioned caseload and the costs associated with the RNE caseload, which is 100 percent GF and is countable toward the TANF maintenance of effort requirement.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

This premise has been updated to reflect updated caseload for Cal Learn Bonuses and Sanctioned Grants.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The change is due to a projected increase in caseload.

## Cal Learn

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly Caseload	8,140	8,294

### EXPENDITURES <sup>1</sup>:

(in 000's)

	2005-06		2006-07	
	Services	Bonuses and Sanctioned Grants	Services	Bonuses and Sanctioned Grants
Total	\$25,936	\$3,840	\$26,573	\$3,937
Federal	24,688	1,041	25,302	1,024
State	1,248	2,799	1,271	2,913
County	0	0	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0	0	0

<sup>1</sup> - The recent noncitizen entrants costs are a subset of these expenditures and are displayed in the "Recent Noncitizen Entrants" premise.

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## **TANF/CalWORKs Administrative Costs – Basic**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the administrative costs for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)/California Work Opportunity and Responsibility for Kids (CalWORKs) Program. The basic costs include the costs for general administration, coordination and overhead of the programs such as the salaries and benefits of staff performing activities related to eligibility determination, preparation of budgets, monitoring programs, fraud and abuse units; services related to accounting, litigation, payroll and personnel; costs for the goods and services required for the administration of the program such as supplies, equipment, utilities, rental of office space and maintenance of office space.

Historically, the budget for county administration was based on counties administrative budget requests made through a Proposed County Administrative Budget (PCAB) process, modified by a cost containment system consistent with Welfare and Institutions (W&I) Code Section 14154. Beginning with Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02 the PCAB process was suspended and the last PCAB process, FY 2000-01, established the base from which future year costs are established. Adjustments for caseload changes and other factors are made during each subvention process.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 14154.
- The Estimate in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is being held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level, which includes a \$25 million reduction pursuant to Senate Bill 68 (Chapter 78, Statutes of 2005).
- The FY 2006-07 base funding for CalWORKs County Administrative Basic is \$651.7 million.
- Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) savings are (\$11,210,000) in FY 2006-07.
- Time limit savings are (\$39,922,000) in FY 2006-07.
- Caseload is projected to decline 1.8 percent in FY 2006-07.
- Additional cases are expected to establish eligibility in the budget year as a result of the Hmong Refugees who will be resettling in California, resulting in an increased cost of \$12,000 in FY 2006-07. The first refugees arrived in July 2004.
- Staff development costs in FY 2006-07 are \$14 million based on actual expenditures from 2004-05.
- Based on the May 2006 CalWORKs Trend Caseload Two-Parent State-Only cases represent 8.04 percent in FY 2006-07, of the total cases.
- In FY 2006-07, \$5.4 million of the CalWORKs Recent Noncitizens Entrants (RNE) expenditures are TANF eligible and are shifted to a separate premise.



---

## TANF/CalWORKs Administrative Costs – Basic

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- Administrative costs (\$272,000) related to the MAGIC automation system in Merced County that were formerly identified in a separate premise line are now included in Basic.
- SAWS Development and Testing Interface costs are \$94,000.
- Contract costs are \$4.1 million for FY 2006-07, based on FY 2004-05 actual expenditures.
- The \$25 million Governor's baseline veto is restored in FY 2006-07.

### METHODOLOGY:

The basic funding from FY 2005-06 is adjusted to reflect caseload decline, staff development expenditures, savings for EBT and time limits, costs for Hmong Refugees, the MAGIC system, contract costs, and the restoration of the \$25 million that was vetoed in the Budget Act. Funds for TANF ineligible RNE were subtracted and shifted to the RNE premise (For more information see separate RNE premise).

### FUNDING:

The State share reflects the cost for the State-Only Two-Parent Program (8.04 percent in FY 2006-07), and TANF eligible persons in mixed RNE households (40.4 percent). The State General Funds are countable toward the State's maintenance of effort requirement. The federal TANF share reflects the administrative costs for the CalWORKs Program.

**Note:** W&I Code Section 15204.4 requires a MOE from the counties based on expenditures during FY 1996-97. Please reference the "County MOE Adjustment" premise.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The FY 2006-07 estimate reflects a decrease in the projected CalWORKs caseload, an increase in staff development expenditures and an increase in time limit savings.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The FY 2006-07 estimate reflects a caseload decline offset by the restoration of the Governor's baseline veto.

## TANF/CalWORKs Administrative Costs – Basic

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$591,914	\$601,619
Federal	576,031	581,687
State	15,883	19,932
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Carryforward From FY 2004-05

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects a reappropriation of unspent funds appropriated in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05 California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Single Allocation. These reappropriated funds were distributed as a planning allocation to augment the FY 2005-06 single allocation. The California Department of Social Services, in consultation with the County Welfare Director's Association, developed the allocation methodology.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2005.

### METHODOLOGY:

Pursuant to Senate Bill 68 (Chapter 78, Statutes of 2005), \$50 million from the unexpended FY 2004-05 CalWORKs Single Allocation funds are being reappropriated for expenditure in FY 2005-06.

The first \$25 million was distributed as an offset to the reduction in Eligibility Administration Basic funding in FY 2005-06. The funds were distributed as a percent to total of each county's allocation.

The remaining \$25 million was distributed as a partial offset to the Prospective Budgeting Savings premise within the Eligibility Administration component of the FY 2005-06 Single Allocation.

### FUNDING:

The funds are 100 percent TANF.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a one time reappropriation.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$50,000	\$0
Federal	50,000	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Administrative Augmentation

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects an augmentation, authorized in the Budget Act of 2005, to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Administration.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2005.

### METHODOLOGY:

Based on requests submitted by 33 counties, \$7.76 million is released from the TANF Reserve in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 to augment the CalWORKs Single Allocation. The augment is based upon justified and demonstrated needs resulting from the impact of the quarterly reporting and prospective budgeting (QR/PB) savings premise.

### FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent TANF.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

Requests submitted by 33 counties, totaling \$7.76 million, were approved.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise is not applicable in FY 2006-07.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$7,764	\$0
Federal	\$7,764	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Single Allocation Reduction

### DESCRIPTION:

Section 15204.2 of the Welfare and Institutions Code provides that state and federal funds shall be appropriated in a single allocation to counties for the support of administrative activities undertaken by the counties to provide benefit payments to CalWORKs recipients and to provide work activities and supportive services in order to efficiently and effectively carry out the purposes of the CalWORKs legislation. Due to pressures on TANF block grant funding and the overall State General Fund (GF) budget, the single allocation for Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07 has been reduced by \$40 million, and these funds have been utilized to offset SGF costs in the Child Welfare Services and Foster Care Programs.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement July 1, 2006.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The FY 2006-07 County CalWORKs Single Allocation will be reduced by \$40 million TANF funds.
- These TANF funds will be utilized to offset GF costs in Child Welfare Services by \$39.1 million and Foster Care by \$0.9 million.
- Counties can backfill the reduction in the single allocation with county performance incentives funds previously earned and allocated to counties but not spent.

### METHODOLOGY:

The funding for CalWORKs Administration will be reduced by \$40 million.

### FUNDING:

This reduction will be one hundred percent TANF funds.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

This is a new premise.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implemented in the budget year.



## Single Allocation Reduction

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

<b>101 – CalWORKs</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>
<b>Administration</b>		
Total	\$0	-\$40,000
Federal	0	-40,000
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursement	0	0

## Legacy System Savings

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings that certain counties will realize following their conversion from outdated Legacy Systems to their new automated systems; Consortium IV (C-IV) and Welfare Case Data System (WCDS) CalWORKs Information Network (CalWIN) systems.

The counties' current costs for Legacy Systems and support are funded through their basic county administrative budgets as an electronic data processing (EDP) cost. With the counties' conversions from their legacy systems to C-IV and WCDS, much of the costs for the Legacy Systems will no longer be needed and will not be supported by the State. Upon conversion to the C-IV and CalWIN automation systems, county automation costs are included in the budgets for their respective Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) consortia.

The C-IV counties are Merced, which implemented in March 2004; Stanislaus, which implemented in April 2004; Riverside, which implemented in August 2004; and San Bernardino, which implemented in September 2004.

The eighteen WCDS counties began conversion to CalWIN with the pilots in Placer and Sacramento Counties in January and March 2005, and will end with Fresno converting in July 2006.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise reflects the legacy system savings beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The Legacy System savings will not be applied until after the last county in a consortium has implemented its SAWS system. Therefore, C-IV county savings will begin in FY 2005-06 and WCDS county savings will begin in FY 2006-07.
- Based on information from San Bernardino and Riverside counties the Legacy System costs for FY 2003-04 were \$13.7 million.
- Identified Residual Costs for San Bernardino and Riverside counties for FY 2005-06 are \$7.2 million.
- Merced County is reflected in a separate premise.
- There are no savings for Stanislaus County, as Stanislaus was essentially a non-automated county prior to implementing C-IV.
- Based on the most recent annualized costs from the 18 WCDS counties, the Legacy System costs for FY 2004-05 were \$49.4 million.
- \$23.6 million was identified as supporting costs for the residual Legacy Systems for the 18 WCDS counties and the additional costs that support CalWIN.

## Legacy System Savings

### METHODOLOGY:

The costs of Legacy Systems were collected through extensive surveys and communications with the counties. Total savings were determined by subtracting the residual costs from the total Legacy Systems costs. Beginning in FY 2005-06, there will be a net savings of \$6.5 million associated with the C-IV counties.

Beginning in FY 2006-07, there will be additional savings of \$25.8 million associated with counties converting to CalWIN, resulting in \$32.3 million in total savings. The savings are distributed to the benefiting programs based on each county's most recent annualized Legacy System costs in FY 2003-04 and FY 2004-05. Those programs are CalWORKs, Foster Care, Food Stamps, and Medi-Cal. The Medi-Cal portion of savings of \$14.9 million in CY and \$14.9 million in BY are reflected in the Department of Health Services budget rather than the California Department of Social Services budget.

### FUNDING:

For Item 101, CalWORKs Administration the funding is Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). For Item 141, Food Stamps and Foster Care Administration the funding is 50 percent Federal, 35 percent State, and 15 percent County.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is an update to the cost allocation plan.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year reflects the additional savings for WCDS counties converting to CalWIN systems savings.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEM 101 -	2005-06	2006-07
CalWORKs		
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	-\$2,884	-\$12,071
Federal	-2,884	-12,071
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Legacy System Savings

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

ITEM 141 -	2005-06	2006-07
<b>Foster Care Admin</b>	County Admin	County Admin
Total	-\$242	-\$1,516
Federal	-121	-758
State	-85	-531
County	-36	-227
Reimbursements	0	0
 ITEM 141 -	 2005-06	 2006-07
<b>Food Stamp Admin</b>	County Admin	County Admin
Total	-\$746	-\$3,909
Federal	-373	-1,955
State	-261	-1,368
County	-112	-586
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Fraud Recovery Incentives

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the incentive payments made annually to counties for the detection of fraud. Assembly Bill (AB) 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) provided that each county shall receive 25 percent of the actual share of savings, including federal funds under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program block grant, resulting from the detection of fraud. This statute, amended by AB 444 (Chapter 1022, Statutes of 2002), now provides that each county shall receive 12.5 percent of the actual amount of aid repaid or recovered by a county resulting from the detection of fraud. These savings/recoveries have been defined as the amounts collected on client-caused (non-administrative error) overpayments. County incentives paid with TANF monies must be used for purposes prescribed under the federal Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-193).

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 11486(j).
- Based on the FNS 209 Status of Claims Against Households, client-caused overpayments represent 71 percent of all collections.
- The total overpayment collections were \$76.1 million for Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05.
- The total estimated overpayment collections are \$72.1 million for FY 2005-06.
- Based on the amount of overpayment collections, incentive payments are made annually to the counties in arrears.
- Effective with the passage of AB 444, the counties receive 12.5 percent of the savings due to client-caused overpayments.
- Overpayments are assumed to be funded 97.5 percent TANF/MOE and 2.5 percent county.

### METHODOLOGY:

The county incentive payment is the product of the total collections multiplied by the TANF share of collections (97.5 percent), multiplied by the percentage of client-caused errors (71 percent), and multiplied by the county incentive (12.5 percent).

### FUNDING:

The costs are 100 percent TANF.

## Fraud Recovery Incentives

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The estimate was updated using the most recent actual data.

---

**REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The budget year reflects a decrease in projected overpayment collections.

**EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
<b>ITEM 101 – TANF</b>	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$6,584	\$6,238
Federal	6,584	6,238
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **TANF and NAFS Programs – PA to NA Fund Shift**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects an allocation of costs to the Food Stamp (FS) administration for FS recipients receiving California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) benefits. Eligibility and ongoing costs for FS recipients that receive CalWORKs are charged as CalWORKs administrative costs. The federal share of administrative costs for FS activities for Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program cases is funded by the United States Department of Agriculture, Food and Nutrition Service (USDA-FNS).

The Department of Health and Human Services Division of Cost Allocation directed the California Department of Social Services to distribute costs for the eligibility determination activity among the benefiting programs. The methodology develops ratios based upon CalWORKs and Public Assistance Food Stamp (PAFS) caseload and administrative expenditure data to determine the portion of the Eligibility, Case Management, and Program Integrity activity costs in CalWORKs that benefit the FS Program. The PAFS allocation for common intake costs is also included in the cost shift.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented in March of 1984.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- The funding for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 was held to the Appropriation level.
- The eligibility worker intake administrative costs are divided equally among CalWORKs, PAFS and Medi-Cal. The PAFS share of the common intake costs is \$38.3 million in FY 2006-07.
- County worker costs for Eligibility, Case Management and Program Integrity activities are claimed to Programs Codes (PC) 614, 663, and 618, respectively, on the county expense claim.
- The ratio of administrative costs for PCs 614, 663 and 618 to the total administrative costs is 0.6866 in FY 2006-07 based on the calendar year 2005 expenditures.
- The ratio of PAFS to the CalWORKs caseload is 0.6112 in FY 2006-07 based on the average ratio for the calendar year 2005 period.
- Based on data reported on the county administrative expense claims, the total CalWORKs administrative cost is \$709,474,734 in calendar year 2005.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The CalWORKs continuing case costs based on actual expenditures adjusted for premise items was multiplied by 0.6866 in FY 2006-07 to determine the value of the PAFS/CalWORKs shared administrative costs. The shared administrative costs were multiplied by 0.6112 in FY 2006-07. The result was then divided in half (50 percent CalWORKs and 50 percent PAFS) to determine the PAFS share. The PAFS share of the common intake costs was then added to determine the total fund shift.



## TANF and NAFS Programs – PA to NA Fund Shift

### FUNDING:

Non-Assistance FS (NAFS) costs are shared 50 percent federal funds (USDA-FNS), 35 percent State General Fund, and 15 percent county funds. The CalWORKs costs shifted are 100 percent federal funds.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year costs were held to the Appropriation level. The budget year costs were revised to reflect updated actual data.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in funds shifting from CalWORKs Administration to FS Administration is due to the inclusion of the Prospective Budgeting Augmentation premise.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
<b>ITEM 101 – TANF</b>	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	-\$163,983	-\$175,707
Federal	-163,983	-175,707
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

	2005-06	2006-07
<b>ITEM 141 – Food Stamps</b>	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$163,983	\$175,707
Federal	81,992	87,854
State	57,394	61,497
County	24,597	26,356
Reimbursements	0	0

## CalWORKs Administrative Cap Adjustment

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects an adjustment to ensure California does not exceed the 15 percent administrative cap required under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program. Under TANF, States may not spend more than 15 percent of either their Federal TANF funds or State's maintenance of effort (MOE) dollars on administrative costs. Administrative costs are defined as costs necessary for the proper administration of the TANF or separate state programs. Expenditures in excess of the 15 percent federal cap are considered a misuse of funds which may result in a reduction in federal TANF funds.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1999.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: 45 Code of Federal Regulations Sections 263.0 and 263.13.
- The administrative cap is applied on a statewide basis rather than county specific.
- Activities considered administrative include, but are not limited to, eligibility determinations, administrative costs incurred by contractors, automation costs not related to tracking and monitoring of TANF requirements, preparation of program plans, procurement, property management, and costs of fraud and abuse units.

### METHODOLOGY:

- Actual State and federal administrative expenditures from October 1, 2001 through September 30, 2002 were compared to the net annual TANF grant and the required State MOE for Federal Fiscal Year 2003, respectively.
- Administrative expenditures were adjusted between federal TANF (8.07 percent) and State MOE (8.10 percent) until the administrative cost percentages were at the lowest common rate.
- The Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 estimate has been updated beginning with the June 2005 quarter to reflect a shift in funds from the federal TANF to State General Fund (GF).
- FY 2006-07 has been calculated using updated administrative expenditure information from June 2004 through July 2005.

### FUNDING:

The administrative cap adjustment consists of a shift from federal funds to the GF or GF to federal funds, whichever is necessary to keep the percentages at the lowest common rate.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

## CalWORKs Administrative Cap Adjustment

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decreased amount shifted in the budget year is due to a decrease in the Federal admin ratio.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	-126,000	-116,000
State	126,000	116,000
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## Court Cases

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects settlement costs and attorney fees relating to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Foster Care (FC), Food Stamp, and Adoption Assistance Programs (AAP). The costs result from the settlement of lawsuits related to local assistance in accordance with Budget Letter 98-22, and instructions from the Department of Finance.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

#### Item 101 – TANF Administration

- A total of \$218,000 is budgeted in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 for attorney fees and settlement costs associated with specific small court cases expected to be paid in the current year (CY).
- A total of \$675,000 is budgeted in FY 2006-07, for the attorney fees associated with small court cases expected to be resolved in the budget year (BY).

#### Item 141 – FC, AAP, and Food Stamp Administration

- A total of \$1,073,298 is budgeted in FY 2005-06 for attorney fees and settlement costs associated with specific small court cases expected to be due in the CY.
- A total of \$1,698,000 is budgeted in FY 2006-07 for the attorney fees associated with specific small court cases expected to be resolved in the BY.

### METHODOLOGY:

#### Item 101 – TANF Administration

The estimate is based on actual and projected attorney fees, settlement costs and miscellaneous writs to be paid in FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07.

#### Item 141 – FC, AAP, and Food Stamp Administration

The estimate is based on actual and projected attorney fees, settlement costs and miscellaneous writs to be paid in FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07.

### FUNDING:

#### Item 101 –TANF Administration

The funding is 100 percent TANF.

#### Item 141 – FC, AAP, and Food Stamp Administration

Attorney fees associated with federally-eligible cases are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent State General Fund (GF). Attorney fees associated with nonfederally-eligible cases are funded 100 percent GF. Court settlement costs are shared at the same ratios as the respective programs (i.e. AAP and AFDC-FC).

## Court Cases

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Court case costs may fluctuate from year to year.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEM 101 –	2005-06	2006-07
<b>TANF Administration</b>	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$218	\$675
Federal	218	675
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0
 ITEM 141 –	 2005-06	 2006-07
<b>FC, AAP, and Food Stamp Administration</b>	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,074	\$1,698
Federal	362	849
State	712	849
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## Medi-Cal Services Eligibility / Common Costs

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with shifting eligibility costs from the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program to the Medi-Cal Program. The Medi-Cal Services Eligibility program was authorized by Welfare and Institutions Code Section 14154 which mandates the California Department of Social Services to instruct counties to modify the eligibility determination process so that eligibility for Medi-Cal is determined prior to eligibility for the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1998.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and 2006-07 anticipated initial eligibility determination expenditures are \$141.0 million, which represents 18.02 percent of the total CalWORKs eligibility expenditures and \$141.8 million, which represents 17.64 percent of the total CalWORKs eligibility expenditures.
- The estimate in FY 2005-06 is being held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.
- The anticipated CalWORKs county administrative cost for FY 2006-07 is \$651.7 million.
- The Medi-Cal, CalWORKs, and Food Stamps programs each share one third of the initial eligibility determination common costs.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimate was determined by applying the initial eligibility determination expenditures percentage (18.02 percent) to FY 2005-06 and (17.64 percent) to the FY 2006-07 anticipated CalWORKs county administrative cost and then dividing it by the three programs to determine the Medi-Cal share.

### FUNDING:

The State General Fund (GF) share (8.14 percent for FY 2005-06 and 8.04 percent for FY 2006-07) reflects the cost for the State-Only Two-Parent Program which was implemented October 1, 1999. The State-Only Two-Parent Program is countable toward the State's maintenance of effort requirement.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The cost is updated to reflect the most current actual expenditures and is distributed among the benefiting programs (CalWORKs, Food Stamps, and Medi-Cal).

## Medi-Cal Services Eligibility / Common Costs

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The cost is updated to reflect the most current actual expenditures and is distributed among the benefiting programs (CalWORKs, Food Stamps, and Medi-Cal).

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	-\$39,149	-\$38,323
Federal	-35,942	-35,241
State	-3,207	-3,082
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Research and Evaluation

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs to develop a research design to ensure a thorough evaluation of the direct and indirect effects of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program. The research and evaluation was authorized by Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) sections 11520 through 11521.7. An independent evaluator or evaluators shall conduct the statewide evaluation. The outcomes derived from these evaluations will be provided through discrete reports issued at regular intervals and will include information regarding process, impacts, and analyses of the costs and benefits of the CalWORKs Program.

The California Department of Social Services will ensure that county demonstration projects and other innovative county approaches to CalWORKs Program implementation are rigorously evaluated and that the findings are reported to the Legislature in a timely fashion. The evaluation of a county-specific program shall be developed in conjunction with the county and other appropriate agencies responsible for the local program.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC sections 11520 through 11521.7.
- Assembly Bill 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) mandated the evaluation of the statewide CalWORKs Program and county demonstration projects such as school attendance, monthly change reporting, etc.
- In Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07 \$1.5 million shall be utilized to implement a peer review program of individual county performance to identify best practices and obstacles to improved CalWORKs performance outcomes.

### METHODOLOGY:

The funding FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 have been held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.

### FUNDING:

The State share (11 percent) reflects the cost for the State-Only Two-Parent Program that implemented October 1, 1999. The State-Only Two-Parent Program is countable toward the State's maintenance of effort requirement. The federal TANF share (89 percent) reflects the cost for all other research and evaluation projects.



## Research and Evaluation

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

- In the BY \$1.5 million will be utilized to implement a peer review program of individual county performance to identify best practices and obstacles to improved CalWORKs performance outcomes.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$4,000	\$4,000
Federal	3,560	3,560
State	440	440
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## County Maintenance of Effort Adjustment

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs counties are required to expend from their general funds or from the social services account of the County Health and Welfare Trust Fund to support administration of programs providing services to needy families, and the administration of food stamps. Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 15204.4 authorized the county maintenance of effort (MOE).

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC section 15204.4.
- The individual county requirement for spending is equal to that amount which was expended by the county for comparative activities during Fiscal Year (FY) 1996-97. Failure to meet this required level will result in a proportionate reduction in funds provided as part of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program single allocation.
- The FY 1996-97 actual county expenditures are \$140,540,757. This amount represents the county MOE requirement. The programs inclusive for this expenditure data are as follows: Temporary Assistance for Needy Families; Non-Assistance Food Stamps; Greater Avenues for Independence (GAIN); Cal Learn, Health & Safety (for child care); Transitional Child Care Administration; and Non-GAIN Education & Training Program.

### METHODOLOGY:

The funds reflected in this premise are the total statewide expenditures for FY 1996-97 minus the estimated county expenditures for the administration of the Food Stamp (FS) Program for FY's 2005-06 and 2006-07, which are \$81,403,009 and \$88,818,647 respectively.

### FUNDING:

This is a shift from federal to county funds.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The budget year (BY) decrease is due to an increase in the county share of cost in the FS Program.

## County Maintenance of Effort Adjustment

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decreased amount shifted in the BY is due to an increase in the county share of cost in the FS Program.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	-57,462	-51,723
State	0	0
County	57,462	51,723
Reimbursements	0	0

## Prospective Budgeting Augmentation

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects an offset to budgeted CalWORKs administrative savings for Prospective Budgeting. This premise served as a placeholder until a more thorough analysis of the actual impact to county workload could be completed. The California Department of Social Services received feedback from counties that indicated the level of savings anticipated for Prospective Budgeting had not materialized. The Department completed an eight county time study during October and November 2005 to gauge actual time required for quarterly reporting and prospective budgeting (QR/PB) activities. Based on analysis of this time study, the Prospective Budgeting premise was re-estimated, and this placeholder was eliminated.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise was a placeholder and did not implement.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Analysis of time study data collected in October 2005 and November 2005 determined revised Prospective Budgeting CalWORKs administrative savings for FY 2006-07. This is reflected in the Prospective Budgeting premise.

### METHODOLOGY:

Analysis of time study data collected in October 2005 and November 2005 determined revised Prospective Budgeting CalWORKs administrative savings for FY 2006-07. This is reflected in the Prospective Budgeting premise.

### FUNDING:

Not Applicable.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

Analysis of time study data collected in October 2005 and November 2005 determined revised Prospective Budgeting CalWORKs administrative savings for FY 2006-07. This is reflected in the Prospective Budgeting premise.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Not Applicable.

## Prospective Budgeting Augmentation

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

101 – CalWORKs	2005-06	2006-07
Administration		
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursement	0	0

## **CalWORKs Child Care - Stage One Services and Administration**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the cost for Stage One Child Care to the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program single-parent families who are newly working or beginning participation in a work activity while on aid, two-parent families who are participating in approved CalWORKs activities, former CalWORKs recipients who are unable to transfer to Stage Two or Three due to lack of available slots, and to eligible teen parents participating in the Cal Learn Program. Child care services are available to CalWORKs families with children under 13 years of age.

Assembly Bill 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997) authorized CalWORKs Stage One Child Care. Child care services for Cal Learn participants were authorized by Senate Bill (SB) 35 (Chapter 69, Statutes of 1993) and SB 1078 (Chapter 1252, Statutes of 1993).

The CalWORKs Child Care Program is administered in three stages. Stage One is funded through the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). Stage Two is funded through the California Department of Education (CDE). Stage Two serves individuals determined to be in a more stable situation, either working or participating in a work activity while on aid, and participants transitioning off aid due to increased employment. Stage Three is also funded through CDE and serves participants who have been off aid for two years.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 10553, 10554, and 11331.7
- The services and administration funding for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.
- In FY 2006-07, the cost of providing CalWORKs child care per child used the following key data/assumptions:
  - ◆ The projected monthly caseload is 54,386 based on a regression analysis projection using actual caseload reported on the CW 115 and CW 115A reports.
  - ◆ The monthly cost of CalWORKs child care is \$564 per child. This is based on child care expenditures and caseload from Calendar Year 2005 as reported on the county expense claims and the CW 115 and CW 115A reports.
  - ◆ The CalWORKs child care administrative ratio of 11.04 percent is based on the actual administrative expenditures compared to service expenditures for Calendar Year 2005.
  - ◆ The child care costs for the two-parent families separate state program is 5 percent based on Stage One expenditures from Calendar Year 2005.

## **CalWORKs Child Care - Stage One Services and Administration**

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):**

- ◆ The child care costs for the recent influx of Hmong refugees is 0.04 percent.
- ◆ The child care costs for the Recent Noncitizen Entrants (RNEs) is one percent based on Stage One expenditures from Calendar Year 2005.
- ◆ It is assumed \$10.0 million in Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) is transferred to Title XX for Stage One.
- ◆ The holdback is \$20.5 million based on five percent of the expenditures including the effect of all premises affecting child care basic.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

- The Stage One Child Care services costs are calculated by multiplying the caseload by the cost per child.
- The Stage One Child Care administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the services costs by the administrative ratio.
- The total Stage One Child Care costs are calculated by adding the services and administrative costs.
- The Stage One two-parent child care costs are calculated by multiplying the total Stage One child care costs by five percent. Those funds are then shifted to State General Fund (GF).
- The total Stage One Child Care cost is increased 0.04 percent for the recent influx of Hmong refugees that will receive child care services. This equates to an increase in expenditures of \$158,949.
- One percent of Stage One Child Care costs represent RNEs. Of this one percent, 40.36 percent represent federal households and remains in the Stage One Basic Program, funded with GF. The remaining portion of RNEs is reflected on the RNE premise line. Refer to that premise description for more information.
- The total Stage One Child Care cost is reduced by approximately \$20.8 million and held in the Stage One/Stage Two Holdback. This amount is based on five percent of the total Stage One estimated need.

### **FUNDING:**

Stage One Child Care for single parents is funded with 100 percent TANF. Child Care for two-parent families is funded with 100 percent GF, which is countable toward the State's TANF maintenance-of-effort requirement.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change in the Current Year (CY). The Budget Year (BY) reflects a decrease in caseload and cost per child based on the most current caseload and expenditure information.

## CalWORKs Child Care - Stage One Services and Administration

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease in BY is the net result of decreased caseload and cost per child; in addition, there were overstated savings associated with the 60-month time limit in the CY.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
	Average Monthly Children	Average Monthly Children
Adult Parent	65,128	54,386

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06		2006-07	
	Services	County Admin.	Services	County Admin.
Total	\$351,736	\$46,695	\$347,443	\$38,191
Federal	339,336	44,361	328,404	36,262
State	12,400	2,334	19,039	1,929
County	0	0	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0	0	0



***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Stage One Child Care RMR Impact

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost impact to California's subsidized child care system from the updated Regional Market Rate (RMR) Ceilings. California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) participants that are receiving CalWORKs Stage One and Stage Two child care will be affected by these RMR updates.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2006.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The estimated cost impact is based on the most recent Regional Market Survey.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07, the cost impact to Stage One is \$8.1 million as a result of the RMR updates.
- For FY 2006-07, the cost impact to Stage Two is \$12.7 million as a result of the RMR updates. The impact is reflected in the "Transfer to CDE for Stage Two" premise.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimated costs are based on statistical modeling techniques that incorporated the Administration's proposals.

### FUNDING:

This premise reflects 100 percent Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF).

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

This is a new premise.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a new premise.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	0	\$8,101
Federal	0	8,101
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## State-Only Cal Learn Child Care

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of providing child care services to sanctioned teen parents participating in the Cal Learn Program. The Cal Learn Program, including child care services, was authorized by Senate Bill (SB) 35 (Chapter 69, Statutes of 1993) and SB 1078 (Chapter 1252, Statutes of 1993). Assembly Bill 2772 (Chapter 902, Statutes of 1998) changed the status of the Cal Learn Program from a five-year federal demonstration project to a permanent program.

Federal law (Public Law 104-193) prohibits the use of Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) funds to teen parents who do not participate in school or another approved activity. Cal Learn teen parents who do not attend school, do not turn in a report card or receive poor grades are subject to a \$100 sanction. Because the Cal Learn Program operated under a five-year federal waiver as a California Work Pays Demonstration Project, the program was not affected by the federal rules. However, effective March 31, 1999, the federal waivers for the Cal Learn Program expired. In order to provide support services to sanctioned teens, the cost for the State-Only Cal Learn Child Care Program is funded with State General Fund (GF).

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on April 1, 1999.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11331.7.
- The services and administration funding for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.
- The percentage of sanctioned teens for FY 2006-07 are three hundredths of a percent based on the total CalWORKs Stage One Child Care expenditures from Calendar Year 2005 as reported on the county expense claims.
- Refer to the "Stage One Services and Administration" premise for more information regarding the Cal Learn Child Care estimate.

### METHODOLOGY:

The sanction rate for each year was applied to the total Stage One Child Care cost to determine the State-Only Cal Learn Child Care need.

### FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent GF and is countable toward the State's maintenance of effort (MOE) under the TANF federal requirements.

## State-Only Cal Learn Child Care

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change in the current year. The budget year reflects a decrease in caseload and cost per child based on the most current caseload and expenditure information.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease in the budget year is the result of a decrease in caseload and cost per child.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$109	\$103
Federal	0	0
State	109	103
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Child Care – Trustline

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for providing a state-mandated registration program that includes fingerprinting of certain child care providers and applicants as well as searching the California Criminal History System and the California Child Abuse Central Index. The Trustline Program was authorized by Assembly Bill (AB) 2053 (Chapter 898, Statutes of 1994), AB 2560 (Chapter 1268, Statutes of 1994), and AB 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997). Senate Bill (SB) 933 (Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998) mandated that a second set of fingerprints is required to search the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). In addition, SB 933 required fingerprint and search requirements to be funded for certain fee-exempt providers. AB 1659 (Chapter 881, Statutes of 1999) added certain categories of licensed fee-exempt providers for FBI background checks.

Trustline registration is required for child care providers in Stage One Child Care compensated by the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program. This premise also includes the reimbursement cost for processing applications referred by the California Department of Education (CDE) and licensed fee-exempt providers.

The Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD) is responsible for processing the applications pursuant to AB 753 (Chapter 843, Statutes of 1997). CCLD contracts with the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the California Child Care Resource and Referral (CCR&R) Network to process the fingerprint and index search file activities. Additionally, CCLD contracts with Identix Identification Services, LLC, a private vendor, for the Live Scan fingerprinting. The Live Scan fingerprint process is an electronic technology that transfers images of fingerprints and personal information to the DOJ in a matter of seconds.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The initial program implementation was September 1, 1995. The implementation for the second set of fingerprints, as required by SB 933, was January 1, 1999.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11324.
- Providers for CalWORKs participants who are currently licensed, or who are an aunt, uncle or grandparent of the child, are exempt from Trustline requirements. In addition, providers whose services are used less than 30 days are not required to register in Trustline.
- Voluntary applicants pay fees to cover all costs associated with their Trustline registration.
- The Trustline applications for voluntary applicants who do not use Live Scan are included in this premise because the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) is required to reimburse the DOJ, Identix, and CCR&R Network for these costs. Payments from the voluntary applicants are reflected as State General Fund revenue.
- For voluntary applicants using Live Scan, this premise includes only the CCR&R Network costs. These applicants pay a fee directly to Identix to cover Live Scan and DOJ charges.
- The funding for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is being held to the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.

## Child Care – Trustline

### KEY DATA ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- In FY 2006-07, the cost of providing for the Trustline for CDSS, CDE, and voluntary applicants is based on the following key data and assumptions:
- The projected number of Trustline applications in the budget year (BY) for CDE, CDSS, and voluntary are 24,188. This is based on a 24-month regression analysis using the number of actual applications for Trustline fingerprinting from Calendar Year 2004 to Calendar Year 2005.
- The manual-to-automated fingerprinting for CDSS and CDE caseloads uses a ratio of 8:92 based on historical data and is applied to the caseload.
- The manual-to-automated fingerprinting for voluntary caseloads uses a ratio of 34:66 based on historical data and is applied to the caseload.
- The county administration cost per case is \$84 based on actual county expenditures divided by the number of DOJ applications for Calendar Year 2005.
- The fees for the contracted services are as follows:

	<u>FY 2005-06</u>	<u>FY 2006-07</u>
DOJ Fingerprinting/Criminal history file	\$32	\$32
DOJ California Child Abuse Central Index	\$15	\$15
DOJ FBI Fingerprints	\$24	\$24
CCR&R Network	\$25	\$25
Identix Cardscan Fee <sup>1</sup>	\$10	\$10
Identix Live Scan <sup>1</sup>	\$16	\$16

<sup>1</sup> The Cardscan Fee is not charged for the cases utilizing Live Scan.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The cost of each contract was calculated by multiplying the projected number of Trustline applications by the cost per activity.
- The county administration cost was calculated by multiplying the projected number of CDSS Trustline applications by the county administration cost per case.
- The breakout of funding is as follows:

	<u>FY 2005-06</u>	<u>FY 2006-07</u>
DOJ	\$2,159,057	\$2,859,275
CCR&R Agency	\$ 749,675	\$ 604,700
Sylvan/Identix Live Scan <sup>2</sup>	\$ 431,824	\$ 523,854
County Administrative Costs	\$1,566,086	\$ 1,180,747

<sup>2</sup> Trustline Application Registry Process costs of \$77,000 in the CY and \$144,000 in the BY are included in the Identix Contract.

## Child Care – Trustline

### FUNDING:

The State share reflects the percent of two-parent families utilizing child care. The State-Only Two-Parent Program is countable toward the State's maintenance-of-effort requirement. The federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program share reflects the cost for all other families. All costs associated with services to applicants referred by CDE are funded by reimbursements from CDE. Costs for voluntary applicants are paid from the General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change in the current year. The budget year reflects the inclusion of welfare reform cases.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY amount reflects a decrease in trend caseload.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly CDSS Trustline Caseload	1,360	1,171
Average Monthly CDE Trustline Caseload	995	634
Average Monthly Voluntary Trustline Caseload	144	210

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$4,984	\$3,874
Federal	3,197	2,597
State	456	428
County	0	0
Reimbursements	1,331	849



***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Self-Certification

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the administrative costs associated with assuring that license-exempt child care providers self-certify that they meet the minimum health and safety standards required by Assembly Bill (AB) 2053 (Chapter 898, Statutes of 1994), AB 2560 (Chapter 1268, Statutes of 1994), and AB 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997). Effective October 1, 1998, license-exempt providers must also meet the following minimum standards: the prevention and control of infectious diseases, building and physical premises standards, and minimum health and safety training appropriate to the provider setting. License-exempt child care providers who are aunts, uncles, and grandparents are excluded from these requirements.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1996.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11324.
- In Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, funding is being held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.
- In FY 2006-07, the projected cost of self-certification is based on the following key data and assumptions:
  - ◆ The projected number of Trustline applications (14,057) for CDSS is based on a 24 month linear trend projection using the number of applications for Trustline fingerprinting from Calendar Year 2004 and Calendar Year 2005.
  - ◆ The statewide cost of self-certification (\$92) is based on Calendar Year 2005 actual county expenditures divided by total Trustline applications processed from Calendar Year 2005.

### METHODOLOGY:

The administrative costs for notification of new recipients were developed utilizing the average statewide cost of self-certification multiplied by the total number of Trustline fingerprinting applications.

### FUNDING:

The State share reflects the percentage of two-parent families utilizing child care. The State-Only Two-Parent Program is countable toward the State's maintenance of effort requirement. The federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program share reflects the cost for all other families.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change in the current year. The budget year reflects the inclusion of welfare reform cases.

## Self-Certification

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease in budget year is the result of a decrease in trend caseload and cost per case.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Annual Caseload	16,313	14,057

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,794	\$1,293
Federal	1,695	1,222
State	99	71
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## CalWORKs Child Care Fund Transfer to CDE for Stage Two as CCDBG

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program funds transferred to the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG) for Stage Two. The transfer of TANF funds is authorized by the annual Budget Act. The California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Child Care Program is authorized by Assembly Bill 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997).

The CalWORKs Child Care Program is administered in three stages. Stage One is funded through the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). Stage Two is funded through the California Department of Education (CDE) and serves individuals determined to be in a more stable situation, either working or participating in a work activity while on aid, and participants transitioning off aid due to increased employment. Stage Three is also funded through CDE and serves participants who have been off aid for two years.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1998.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 10553 and 10554.
- The transfer of TANF funds to the CCDBG funds will be completed by CDSS and will represent an increase to the total amount of CCDBG funds available for CalWORKs Child Care.
- The projected monthly caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is 82,890 and FY 2006-07 is 81,145, based on a regression caseload trend analysis utilizing actual caseload reported from CDE.
- In the Current Year (CY) and Budget Year (BY), the monthly cost per child for Stage Two Child Care is \$428 based on Calendar Year 2005 expenditures and caseload.
- In the CY and BY, the administrative ratio is 20.8 percent, based on the comparison between administrative expenditures and service costs from Calendar Year 2005.
- In the CY and BY, the annual family fee offset of 1.3 percent is based on the ratio of family fees and expenditures reported from CDE for Calendar Year 2005.
- The total Stage Two estimated need is \$538.8 million in FY 2005-06 and \$541.8 million in FY 2006-07.
- CDE funds available for Stage Two Child Care are \$160.8 million in FY 2005-06 and \$147.0 million in FY 2006-07.
- In the BY, based on a recent Regional Market Rate (RMR) Survey, the RMR impact is \$12.7 million.

## **CalWORKs Child Care Fund Transfer to CDE for Stage Two as CCDBG**

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):**

- For CY and BY, Stage Two Safety Net caseload is based on the Stage One ratio, actual safety net cases-to-total caseload, multiplied by a factor of two. This adjustment to the ratio for Stage Two was made to account for the difference in the length of time on aid between the two stages (i.e. cases receiving Stage Two child care are likely to have been on aid longer and are closer to timing off aid.)
- The monthly cost of Stage Two Safety Net is \$202 per child. This is based on applying the Stage Two/Stage One basic cost per child ratio (76 percent) to the Stage One Safety Net cost per child (\$266).
- In the CY and BY, \$20.0 million of TANF funds may be transferred to Title XX for child care: \$10.0 million for the Stage One Child Care Program, and \$10.0 million for the Stage Two Child Care Program, in order to broaden access to Child and Adult Care Food Program benefits for low-income children in proprietary child care centers.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

- The services cost was calculated by multiplying the caseload by the cost per case.
- The administrative cost was calculated by multiplying the services cost by the administrative ratio.
- The family fee was calculated by multiplying the sum of services and administrative costs by 1.3 percent.
- The total Stage Two Child Care basic cost was calculated by adding the services cost to the administrative cost and subtracting the family fees.
- The Stage Two Child Care Safety Net costs are calculated by multiplying the safety net caseload by the safety net cost per child. The total cost for FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 is \$16.0 million and \$16.9 million, respectively.
- The total Stage Two Child Care cost was reduced by 5 percent of the Stage One/Stage Two estimated need in the amount of \$26.2 million in FY 2005-06 and \$25.7 million in FY 2006-07. (See the Stage One/Stage Two Holdback premise description for more information.)
- The transfer of TANF funds to CCDBG was calculated by subtracting CDE's available CCDBG and Proposition 98 funding from the net Stage Two Child Care cost.

### **FUNDING:**

Funds are 100 percent TANF transferred to the CCDBG.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The estimate has been updated with the most current caseload and expenditure information. The five percent holdback funds for BY were inadvertently included in the budgeted TANF transfer amount in November.

## CalWORKs Child Care Fund Transfer to CDE for Stage Two as CCDBG

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in BY is the net effect of the impact of implementing new reimbursement rate ceilings offset by a caseload decline, and a decrease in CDE available funds.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$341,817	\$359,120
Federal	341,817	359,120
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## **Child Care Stage One/Two Holdback**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the amount of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program funds established in reserve to be used for Stage One and/or Stage Two California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program child care. The reserve of TANF funds is authorized by the annual Budget Act. The CalWORKs Child Care Program was authorized by Assembly Bill 1542 (Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997).

The CalWORKs Child Care Program is administered in three stages. Stage One is funded through the California Department of Social Services. Stage Two is funded through the California Department of Education (CDE) and serves individuals that the county welfare departments determine to be in a more stable situation, either working or participating in a work activity while on aid, and participants transitioning off aid due to increased employment. Stage Three is also funded through CDE and serves participants that have been off aid for two years and the working poor.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 1998.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 10553 and 10554.
- The services and administration funding for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.
- In FY 2006-07, the net need after adjustments for the Safety Net and Katrina victims needing child care for Stage One Child Care is \$416.6 million.
- In FY 2006-07, the net need after an adjustment for Safety Net for Stage Two Child Care is \$514.1 million.
- A total of 5 percent from Stage One and Stage Two will be held in the reserve.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

- In FY 2005-06, 5 percent of Stage One (\$23.0 million) and Stage Two (\$29.6 million) are summed for a total holdback. No funding is reserved above the need in this premise.
- In FY 2006-07, 5 percent of Stage One (\$21.3 million) and Stage Two (\$25.7 million) are summed for a total holdback. No funding is reserved above the need in this premise.

### **FUNDING:**

Funds are 100 percent TANF. TANF funds will be transferred from the reserve as needed for Stage One Child Care. TANF funds will be transferred from the reserve to the Child Care and Development Block Grant as needed for Stage Two Child Care.

## **Child Care Stage One/Two Holdback**



---

**CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change in the current year. The Budget Year (BY) is updated to reflect the most current caseload and expenditure information.

**REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The BY amount reflects a caseload decline.

**EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$52,636	\$46,970
Federal	52,636	46,970
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

---

# Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs and savings associated with the Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment (Kin-GAP) Program. The Kin-GAP Program is authorized by Senate Bill (SB) 1901 (Chapter 1055, Statutes of 1998) and modified by Assembly Bill (AB) 1111 (Chapter 147, Statutes of 1999).

The Kin-GAP Program is intended to enhance family preservation and stability by recognizing that many foster children are in long-term, stable placements with relatives and that these placements are the permanent plan for the child. Accordingly, a dependent child who has been living with a relative for at least twelve months may receive a subsidy if the relative assumes guardianship and the dependency is dismissed. Once dependency is dismissed, there is no need for continued governmental intervention in the family life through ongoing, scheduled court and social services supervision of the placement.

Kin-GAP rates are equal to 100 percent of the basic foster care rate for children placed in a licensed or approved home as specified at subdivisions (a) to (d), of Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 11461. In addition, when a child is living with a minor parent for whom a Kin-GAP payment is made, the payment shall include an amount for the care and supervision of the child. AB 1111 changed the effective date of the Kin-GAP Program to January 1, 2000.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2000.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC sections 11360 through 11375.
- The Kin-GAP rate equals 100 percent of the basic foster care rate for children placed in a licensed or approved foster family home, as specified in statute.
- Caseload based on actual cases reported on the CA 800 KG (federal) and CA 800 KG (nonfederal), Summary Report of Expenditures for the Kin-GAP Program, through December 2005.
- A State-Only Kin-GAP Program is available for those cases that are not eligible for CalWORKs but would be eligible for the Kin-GAP Program. Based on the caseload reported on the CA 800 KG, nonfederal cases represent an insignificant percentage of the total caseload.
- The average Kin-GAP grant payments are based on the most recent two quarters of actual expenditures and cases reported on the CA 800 KG ending December 2005. The average federal Kin-GAP grant payment is \$519.50 and the average nonfederal Kin-GAP grant payment is \$522.21.
- Based on actual data through December 2005, the average Temporary Assistance for Needy Families) TANF portion of the Kin-GAP rate is \$347.71.
- Savings to Foster Care grants, CalWORKs grants and administration, and Child Welfare Services administration are now included in the respective program's basic costs and are no longer displayed as separate premises.

## Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- Based on actual expenditures through December 2005, the cost of ongoing county Kin-GAP administrative functions is \$22.77 per case per month.
- State and county expenditures associated with all cases are considered to be eligible for the State's TANF maintenance of effort requirement.
- This estimate assumes no Title IV-E funding.

### METHODOLOGY:

To estimate the cost of the Kin-GAP Program, the total number of projected casemonths is multiplied by the average Kin-GAP rate. Kin-GAP administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the projected casemonths by the monthly administrative cost per case.

### FUNDING:

The Kin-GAP rate shall be paid utilizing the applicable regional per-child CalWORKs grant from federal funds received as part of the TANF block grant. The balance of Kin-GAP is paid with 50 percent state and 50 percent county funds. For State-Only Kin-GAP cases, grant and administrative costs are shared 50 percent state and 50 percent county.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The decrease in total costs reflects lower caseload growth than previously forecasted. Kin-GAP administration costs are held at the Appropriation level.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Budget year grant costs increase due to continued caseload growth. Administration costs reflect a decrease due to the current year costs being held at the Appropriation level.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly Caseload	14,697	14,815

## Kinship Guardianship Assistance Payment Program

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Kin-GAP Basic Costs	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$91,623	\$92,357
Federal	61,353	61,691
State	15,135	15,333
County	15,135	15,333
Reimbursements	0	0

Kin-GAP Administration	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$4,717	\$4,048
Federal	4,705	4,040
State	6	4
County	6	4
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## **Title IV-E Child Support Collections/Recovery Fund**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the estimated federal share of Foster Care (FC) child support collections as determined by the California Department of Child Support Services (DCSS). The DCSS is responsible for transferring to the Recovery Fund the federal share of FC collections as reported to the federal government. The FC child support collections offset the Title IV-E share of FC expenditures.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing Statute: Social Security Act, Section 457(6)(e)(1)
- The estimated federal share of FC collections is provided by DCSS based on the most recent budget process.
- The level of federal financial participation (FFP) is assumed to be 50 percent based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The estimates will be provided by DCSS.

### **FUNDING:**

The FC child support collections will offset the Title IV-E share of FC expenditures.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The increase reflects updated FC collections.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The budget year increase reflects updated FC collections.

## Title IV-E Child Support Collections/Recovery Fund

### Offset Collections:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	-\$14,879	-\$14,747
Federal	-14,879	-14,747
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

### Recovery Fund:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$14,879	\$14,747
Federal	14,879	14,747
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## Foster Family Home – Basic Costs

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects expenditures associated with children eligible for foster care payments who are placed in foster family homes (FFHs).

The federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) Program provides funds for out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children removed from the custody of a parent or guardian as a result of a judicial order with requisite findings or a voluntary placement agreement. The State AFDC-FC Program also provides out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children, including those who are residing with a nonrelated legal guardian, relinquished for the purposes of adoption, or placed pursuant to the Indian Child Welfare Act.

FFHs provide 24-hour care and supervision in a family environment for children who cannot live in their own home. FFHs have a capacity of six or less and are either homes licensed by state or county community care licensing agencies or are approved homes of relatives or nonrelated legal guardians. FFH reimbursement rates are based on the age of the child in placement and range from \$425.00 to \$597.00 per month. A specialized care increment may be paid to a family home in addition to the basic rate on behalf of an AFDC-FC child requiring specialized care because of health and/or behavioral problems. A clothing allowance may also be paid in addition to the basic rate on behalf of an AFDC-FC eligible child.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11461.
- The caseload presumed to be eligible for federal and nonfederal FC Program benefits is based on a twelve month period, ending December 2005, as reported by the counties on the FC Caseload Movement and Expenditures Report (CA 237 FC). Federal cases are projected to account for 74.5 percent of total FFH placements, a slight decrease from the 74.7 percent used for the prior projection.
- Federal and nonfederal average grant computations utilized caseload and expenditure data reported by the counties on the CA 237 FC during a seventeen month period ending November 2005. The projected federal grant is \$683.39, and the nonfederal grant is \$792.31.
- The percentage of federally-eligible expenditures is based on actual county expenditure data.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.

### METHODOLOGY:

FFH basic costs are the product of projected federal and nonfederal casemonths and average grant, as identified above.

### FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent State General Fund and 60 percent county.



## Foster Family Home – Basic Costs

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year decline reflects lower caseload growth and lower average grant than were projected for the Governor's Budget.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year decline reflects a projected decline in caseload.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly Caseload	42,574	42,359
Federal Caseload	31,734	31,574
Nonfederal Caseload	10,840	10,785

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
<b>FFH-Basic Costs</b>	<b>Grant</b>	<b>Grant</b>
Total	\$362,941	\$361,105
Federal	113,784	113,197
State	99,665	99,165
County	149,492	148,743
Reimbursements	0	0
	2005-06	2006-07
<b>FFH-Federal</b>	<b>Grant</b>	<b>Grant</b>
Total	\$258,883	\$257,567
Federal	113,784	113,197
State	58,040	57,748
County	87,059	86,622
Reimbursements	0	0

## Foster Family Home – Basic Costs

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
<b>FFH-Nonfederal</b>	Grant	Grant
Total	\$104,058	\$103,538
Federal	0	0
State	41,625	41,417
County	62,433	62,121
Reimbursements	0	0

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
<b>FFH-Nonfederal</b>	Grant	Grant
Total	\$105,441	\$104,318
Federal	0	0
State	42,177	41,727
County	63,264	62,591
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

---

## Group Home – Basic Costs

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with children eligible for foster care payments who are placed in group homes (GHs).

The federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) Program provides funds for out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children removed from the custody of a parent or guardian as a result of a judicial order with requisite findings or a voluntary placement agreement. The State AFDC-FC Program also provides out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children, including those who are residing with a nonrelated legal guardian, relinquished for the purposes of adoption, or placed pursuant to the Indian Child Welfare Act.

GHs are private, nonprofit, nondetention facilities that provide services in a group setting to children in need of care and supervision. GHs are the most restrictive out-of-home placement alternative for children in foster care, providing an option for children with significant emotional or behavioral problems who would otherwise require more restrictive environments. GH programs are reimbursed based on classification levels within a standardized schedule of rates. The reimbursement for rate classification levels (RCL) 1 through 14 ranges from \$1,454 to \$6,371 per month.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11462.
- The caseload presumed to be eligible for federal and nonfederal FC Program benefits is based on a twelve month period, ending December 2005, as reported by the counties on the FC Caseload Movement and Expenditures Report (CA 237 FC). Federal cases are projected to account for 63.4 percent of total GH placements, which is a slight increase from the prior projection of 62.9 percent.
- Federal and nonfederal average grant computations utilized caseload and expenditure data reported by the counties on the CA 237 FC during the most recent seventeen month period ending November 2005. The projected federal grant is \$4,823.25 and the nonfederal grant is \$4,937.39.
- The percentage of federally-eligible expenditures is based on actual county expenditure data.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.

### METHODOLOGY:

Basic costs are the product of federal and nonfederal casemonths and average grant, as identified above. Federal, State and county sharing ratios are based on county expenditure data.

### FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent State General Fund and 60 percent county.

## Group Home – Basic Costs

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year decline reflects lower caseload growth and lower average grant than were projected for the Governor's Budget.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year increase reflects anticipated caseload growth.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly Caseload	11,412	11,437
Federal Caseload	7,232	7,247
Nonfederal Caseload	4,180	4,190

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

#### GH – Basic Costs

	2005-06 Grant	2006-07 Grant
Total	\$666,222	\$667,682
Federal	186,791	187,198
State	191,772	192,194
County	287,659	288,290
Reimbursements	0	0

#### GH – Federal

Total	\$418,547	\$419,459
Federal	186,791	187,198
State	92,702	92,904
County	139,054	139,357
Reimbursements	0	0

#### GH – Nonfederal

Total	\$247,675	\$248,223
Federal	0	0
State	99,070	99,290
County	148,605	148,933
Reimbursements	0	0

## Foster Family Agency – Basic Costs

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with children eligible for foster care payments who are placed with foster family agencies (FFAs).

The federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC) Program provides funds for out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children removed from the custody of a parent or guardian as a result of a judicial order with requisite findings or a voluntary placement agreement. The State AFDC-FC Program also provides out-of-home care on behalf of otherwise eligible children, including those who are residing with a nonrelated legal guardian, relinquished for the purposes of adoption, or placed pursuant to the Indian Child Welfare Act.

FFAs are nonprofit agencies licensed to recruit, certify, train and support foster parents for children needing placement. FFAs primarily serve children who would otherwise require group home care. FFA treatment rates are established by using a basic rate similar to the foster family home rate plus a set increment for the special needs of the child, an increment for social work activities, and a percentage for administration, recruitment and training. Treatment rates are based on the age of the child in placement and range from \$1,589 to \$1,844 per month. Reimbursement rates for FFAs participating in the Intensive Treatment Foster Care Program are based on the level of services provided to the child and range from \$2,985 to \$4,476. A clothing allowance may also be paid in addition to the FFA rate for an AFDC-FC eligible child.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 11463 and 18358.3.
- The caseload presumed to be eligible for federal and nonfederal FC Program benefits are based on a twelve month period ending December 2005, as reported by the counties on the FC Caseload Movement and Expenditures Report (CA 237 FC). Federal cases are projected to account for 83.2 percent of total FFA placements, a slight increase from the 82.4 percent used for the prior projection.
- Federal and nonfederal average grants are based on caseload and expenditure data reported by the counties on the CA 237 FC during the most recent seventeen month period ending November 2005. The projected federal grant is \$1,648.00, and the nonfederal grant is \$1,723.15.
- The percentage of federally-eligible expenditures is based on actual county expenditure data.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.

### METHODOLOGY:

Basic costs are the product of federal and nonfederal casemonths and average grant, as identified above. Federal, State and county sharing ratios are based on county expenditure data.

### FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent State General Fund and 60 percent county.

Total	\$67,271	\$69,017
Federal	0	0
State	26,909	27,607
County	40,362	41,410
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children Basic Costs**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the out-of-home board and care costs associated with children placed in accordance with the Seriously Emotionally Disturbed (SED) Program. Assembly Bill (AB) 3632 (Chapter 1747, Statutes of 1984) and AB 882 (Chapter 1274, Statutes of 1985) authorized the SED Program as a separate out-of-home care component. Eligible participants are children designated as SED by the California Department of Education (CDE).

Senate Bill 485 (Chapter 722, Statutes of 1992) modified the program by eliminating any California Department of Social Services participation in funding "for profit" facilities, shifting responsibility for the cost of children in those facilities to the CDE and local education agencies.

Payments may be made on behalf of SED children placed in privately operated residential facilities licensed in accordance with the Community Care Facilities Act, and shall be based on foster care rates established in accordance with Welfare and Institutions (W&I) Code Sections 11460 to 11467, inclusive. Most SED children are placed in group home psychiatric peer group Rate Classification Levels 12 through 14; however, some children are placed in foster family homes or foster family agencies. As there is no court adjudication, these children are eligible only for nonfederal foster care program benefits.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 1987.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: W&I Code Sections 18350-18356.
- Casemonths are based on trend caseload projections.
- Average grants are based on actual expenditure and caseload data for the most recent seventeen months ending in November 2005. The projected average grant for Los Angeles County is \$5,290.18. The projected average grant for the remaining counties is \$5,700.83.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

SED costs are the product of projected casemonths and the computed average grant. Program costs are the aggregate of separate projections for Los Angeles County and the remaining 57 counties.

### **FUNDING:**

SED costs are shared 40 percent State General Fund and 60 percent county funds.



## Seriously Emotionally Disturbed Children

### Basic Costs

#### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year estimate reflects an increase in caseload and an increase in average grant than were projected for the Governor's Budget.

#### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year estimate reflects adjustments for caseload growth.

#### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly Caseload	1,428	1,439

#### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$95,235	\$95,963
Federal	0	0
State	38,094	38,385
County	57,141	57,578
Reimbursements	0	0

## Supplemental Clothing Allowance

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects expenditures associated with an augmentation of \$100 per child to the existing clothing allowance program for children placed in foster family homes (FFHs) or certified family homes of foster family agencies (FFAs).

Currently, counties have the authority to provide a clothing allowance, in addition to the basic foster care rate paid on behalf of eligible foster children. This premise reflects an augmentation to the current program funding level, allowing for an annual supplemental clothing allowance of \$100 per child with no county share of cost.

Counties that currently have clothing allowance expenditures are expected to maintain their current level of funding in the program. The additional state and federally funded clothing allowance is intended to supplement not supplant current spending levels.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 11461(f) (4) and 11463(g).
- The statewide annual supplemental clothing allowance will be \$100 per child.
- All FFH and FFA placements are eligible for the clothing allowance. The average monthly projected caseload is 61,923 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, and 62,205 for FY 2006-07.
- All cases shifting to the Kin-GAP Program are presumed to receive the clothing allowance prior to exiting foster care.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.

### METHODOLOGY:

Expenditures for the statewide supplemental clothing allowance are a product of the projected cases and the \$100 allowance.

## Supplemental Clothing Allowance

### FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for those cases meeting eligibility criteria, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP rate. Funding for the nonfederal share of federal program costs and for those cases not meeting federal eligibility criteria is 100 percent State General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year estimate reflects lower caseloads than projected for the Governor's Budget.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year estimate reflects a projected increase in caseload.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$6,192	\$6,220
Federal	2,391	2,404
State	3,801	3,816
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Title XX Funding

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the Title XX Social Services Block Grant awarded to the State as well as the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds that are transferred to Title XX. This funding is provided under Title XX of the federal Social Security Act as amended by the federal Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981. Federal funding for social services has been given to states under Title XX since October 1981. In order to qualify for these funds, a state must prepare an expenditure plan prior to the start of the state fiscal year that is consistent with the five Title XX goals:

1. Achieving or maintaining economic self-support to prevent, reduce, or eliminate dependency;
2. Achieving or maintaining self-sufficiency, including reduction or prevention of dependency;
3. Preventing or remedying neglect, abuse or exploitation of children or adults unable to protect their own interests; or preserving, rehabilitating or reuniting families;
4. Preventing or reducing inappropriate institutional care by providing for community-based care, home-based care, or other forms of less intensive care; and,
5. Securing referral or admission for institutional care when other forms of care are not appropriate or providing services to individuals in institutions.

Through Fiscal Year (FY) 1992-93, Title XX funds were used exclusively to fund the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Program. With the implementation of the Title XIX Personal Care Services Program in 1993, a portion of the Title XX funds was shifted to other eligible programs. Those funds now support the following programs:

- IHSS Residual Program (goals 3 and 4);
- Foster Care services (goal 3);
- Child Welfare Services (CWS) (goals 3 and 4);
- Deaf Access Program (goals 1 and 2); and,
- Community Care Licensing (CCL) (goals 3 and 4).

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 13000 through 13008.
- State legislation permits Title XX funds to be used in CWS and Foster Care to supplant the State share without affecting county funds.
- The Title XX funding awarded to California was \$206.3 million for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2005 and \$206.3 million for FFY 2006. An additional \$191.5 million in TANF grant dollars will be transferred to Title XX in FY 2005-06, and \$191.6 million in FY 2006-07.
- The FFY awards are adjusted to conform to FY funding needs.

## Title XX Funding

### METHODOLOGY:

- In Current Year (CY) \$54.0 million in TANF grant dollars will be transferred into the Title XX Block Grant to fund services for children residing in group homes. The funds increase to \$55.0 million in Budget Year (BY).
- For FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07, \$147.9 million in Title XX funds are being shifted to the Department of Developmental Services (DDS). In addition, TANF funds are transferred to Title XX for the following purposes: \$61.5 million in FY 2005-06 and \$60.6 million in FY 2006-07 to supplant a portion of the State share of CWS eligible expenditures in the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), and \$56.0 million in both FYs is added to the Title XX funds shifted to DDS.
- For both CY and BY in the Deaf Access Program, \$3.2 million Title XX funds will reduce State General Fund (GF) in an otherwise 100 percent GF program.
- In CCL, in CY \$2.0 million in Title XX funds will be used for non-Title IV-E claimable costs. The amount decreases to \$0.119 million in BY.
- In State Support, \$53.2 million in Title XX funds will be used in CCL. The amount will increase to \$55 million in BY.
- In the CY and BY, \$20.0 million of TANF funds may be transferred to Title XX for child care: \$10 million for CDSS' Stage One Child Care program and \$10 million for the California Department of Education's (CDE) child care programs, in order to broaden access to Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP) benefits for low-income children in proprietary child care centers.

### FUNDING:

Title XX is a federal block grant that does not require a state or county match.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The Title XX transfer from TANF for Foster Care has increased to reflect actual expenditures. For FY 2006-07, the Title XX transfer from TANF to CWS has increased due to an increase in Title XX-eligible costs.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The Title XX transfer from TANF to CWS has decreased due to a decrease in Title XX-eligible costs. The CCL increase from CY to BY for non-Title IV-E claimable costs and the CCL State Support decrease is due to a technical adjustment.

## Title XX Funding

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
<b>Total Title XX</b>	<b>\$397,764</b>	<b>\$397,853</b>
Title XX Grant	206,275	206,275
TANF Transfer In	191,489	191,578
 <b>Foster Care (Item 101)</b>	 \$0	 \$0
<u>Foster Care (Transfer from TANF)</u>		
Federal	54,000	54,989
State	-54,000	-54,989
 <b>CWS (Item 151)</b>	 \$203,903	 \$203,903
<u>CWS (Transfer to DDS)</u>	\$203,903	\$203,903
<u>CWS (Title XX Transfer to DDS)</u>	\$147,903	\$147,903
Federal	147,903	147,903
State	0	0
<u>CWS (Transfer from TANF)</u>		
<u>For Transfer to DDS</u>		
Federal	56,000	56,000
State	0	0
 <b>For CWS</b>		
Federal	61,489	60,589
State	-61,489	-60,589

## Title XX Funding

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
<b>Deaf Access (Item 151)</b>	\$0	\$0
Federal	3,200	3,200
State	-3,200	-3,200
<b>CCL (Item 151)</b>	\$0	\$0
Federal	2,019	119
State	-2,019	-119
<b>CCL (State Support)</b>	\$0	\$0
Federal	53,153	55,053
State	-53,153	-55,053
<b>CalWORKs Child Care (Transfer from TANF)</b>		
	\$20,000	\$20,000
Federal	20,000	20,000
State	0	0

## **Rosales v. Thompson**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs and savings associated with implementing the Ninth Circuit (federal) Court of Appeals decision of March 3, 2003 in *Rosales v. Thompson*, 321 F 3d 835 (9<sup>th</sup> CIR. [CAL]). In *Rosales v. Thompson*, the Court of Appeals upheld an earlier State Court decision that re-interpreted federal statute so as to broaden eligibility and extend federal

Title IV-E Foster Care (FC) benefits to relatives caring for foster children who were previously eligible only for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) benefits at significantly lower rates. The *Rosales v. Thompson* decision also impacts Nonfederal FC children originally placed with a relative during the retroactive period allowed by the court who have since moved to a nonrelative placement. The net effect will be increased federal FC costs and decrease State and local FC costs. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) savings will also result as children shift from CalWORKs to the FC payment program.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

The first *Rosales v. Thompson* costs were realized in Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Due to the actual claims submitted by counties, the estimated cases expected to transfer from CalWORKs to Title IV-E FC was lower than anticipated, while cases transferring from the nonfederal FC Program were higher than anticipated. The May 2006 Revise assumes that the majority of cases transferring to Title IV-E federally eligible FC were from State Only FC.
- Based on actual claims submitted by counties, the estimate assumes no measurable impact on the Adoption Assistance Program (AAP).
- Each CalWORKs case shifting to the federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children – Foster Care (AFDC-FC) benefit program is assumed to be eligible for a Supplemental Clothing Allowance.
- TANF administrative savings are based on quarterly savings of \$57.57 per hour.
- The CalWORKs grant savings associated with the FY 2005-06 Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) is included in the July 2005 Maximum Aid Payment (MAP) COLA premise.



## **Rosales v. Thompson**

### **METHODOLOGY:**

#### **Item 101 - Assistance Payments**

- The AFDC-FC grant costs are the product of total casemonths and the average AFDC-FC Grant, plus the cost of supplemental clothing allowances.
- CalWORKs grant savings are calculated by multiplying the number of impacted children by the average zero-parent per child grant. The total CalWORKs grant savings is minimal for Current Year (CY) and Budget Year (BY).

#### **Item 101 - CalWORKs Administration**

- The CalWORKs administrative savings for the BY is calculated by dividing the quarterly administrative cost by three months to obtain a monthly cost of \$19.19 per case per month. This cost is then multiplied by the number of child-only cases impacted.

#### **Item 141 - County Administration**

- The prospective administrative cost associated with this shift is based on the average AFDC-FC administrative cost per casemonth of \$32.78 based on FY 2004-05 data.

### **FUNDING:**

#### **Item 101 – CalWORKs**

CalWORKs grant payments for child-only cases are shared 97.5 percent TANF, and 2.5 percent county funds. CalWORKs administrative costs for these cases are funded with 100 percent TANF funds.

#### **Item 101 – Foster Care**

Federal funding for AFDC-FC assistance payments is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for cases meeting eligibility criteria. The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP). Funding for the non-federal AFDC-FC program and the non-federal share of federal program costs is 40 percent General Fund (GF) and 60 percent county funds.

#### **Item 141 - County Administration**

Foster Care Administrative costs are shared 50 percent federal, 35 percent State and 15 percent county.

## **Rosales v. Thompson**

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

Based on actual claims data, there is a larger shift of Nonfederal Foster Care cases to federal foster care, resulting in a GF savings. Foster Care and CalWORKs administration are held to the Appropriation.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

In the BY, Foster Care and CalWORKs administration was changed to reflect actual costs.

### **EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
<b>Item 101 - Foster Care</b>	Grant	Grant
Total	\$ 362	\$ 362
Federal	2,357	2,357
State	-800	-800
County	-1,195	-1,195
Reimbursements	0	0

	2005-06	2006-07
<b>Item 141 - Foster Care</b>	Admin	Admin
Total	\$3,092	\$171
Federal	1,546	85
State	1,082	60
County	464	26
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Rosales v. Thompson**

### **EXPENDITURES (continued):**

	2005-06	2006-07
<b>Item 101 – CalWORKs</b>	Grant	Grant
Total	-\$ 52	-\$ 72
Federal	-51	-72
State	0	0
County	-1	-2
Reimbursements	0	0

	2005-06	2006-07
<b>Item 101 – CalWORKs</b>	Admin	Admin
Total	-\$527	-\$ 3
Federal	-527	-3
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## **Rosales v. Thompson (Reversal)**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

The Federal Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 clarified federal statute which in effect reversed the expanded eligibility criteria for relatives established by the *Rosales v. Thompson* Court Ruling. (See the Rosales vs. Thompson premise). The net effect will be decreased federal costs, and increased State and local FC costs.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

Implementation date of February 8, 2006.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- It is assumed that federal funding will continue for cases that entered foster care prior to February 8, 2006.
- For cases entering foster care on or after February 8, 2006, it is assumed that those cases will no longer be eligible for Title IV-E funding but will be eligible for nonfederal foster care or the CalWORKs program.
- Due to the actual claims submitted by counties, the majority of foster care entries expected to be impacted will be placed in nonfederal FC, while a smaller number of new foster care entries will receive a CalWORKs child only grant.
- Based on actual claims submitted by counties, the estimate assumes no measurable impact on the Adoption Assistance Program (AAP) or the CalWORKs child only caseload.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

#### **Item 101 - Assistance Payments**

The AFDC-FC grant costs are the product of total casemonths and the average federal and non-federal AFDC-FC Grant , plus the cost of supplemental clothing allowances.

### **FUNDING:**

#### **Item 101 – Foster Care**

Federal funding for AFDC-FC assistance payments is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for cases meeting eligibility criteria. The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP). Funding for the non-federal AFDC-FC program is 40 percent GF and 60 percent county funds.

#### **Item 141 - County Administration**

The impact to Administrative costs are located the Rosales vs. Thompson premise.

## **Rosales v. Thompson**

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

This is a new premise.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

CY reflects case impacted from February 2006 to June 2006. BY reflects annualized estimates.

### **EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
<b>Item 101 - Foster Care</b>	Grant	Grant
Total	-\$ 34	-\$ 310
Federal	-241	-2,218
State	83	763
County	-124	1,145
Reimbursements	0	0

## Promoting Safe and Stable Families Savings

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings in the Foster Care (FC) Program as a result of the incremental increase in the Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) grant — formerly the Federal Family Preservation and Support Program.

The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 established the capped PSSF grant program under Title IV-B to provide funding for community-based family support and preservation services. By providing preservation services, it is expected that some children in out-of-home care will spend less time in placement resulting in savings to the FC Program.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1994.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16600 through 16604.5
- Effective in Fiscal Year 2001-02, based on federal requirements, a minimum of 20 percent of PSSF funds must be spent on each of the four components of the program (Family Preservation Services, Family Support Services, Adoption Promotion and Support, and Time-Limited Family Reunification).

### METHODOLOGY:

Since the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2005 grant was less than FFY 2004 and the FFY 2006 grant is projected to be at the 2005 level, there are no additional, incremental savings to foster care grants in current year (CY) or budget year (BY). All savings from the PSSF Grants are already reflected in the Foster Care trends. See the Promoting Safe and Stable Families premise.

### FUNDING:

There are no additional incremental PSSF Foster Care Savings in CY or BY.

### CHANGE FROM THE APPROPRIATION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## Promoting Safe and Stable Families Savings

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Supportive Transitional Emancipation Program**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the cost to provide financial support to emancipating foster youth up to age 21 if participating in an educational or training program or any activity consistent with their "transitional independent living plan." These payments are authorized by Assembly Bill 427 (Chapter 125, Statutes of 2001) which added Section 11403.1 to the Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC). This premise also reflects the administrative costs for updating the Transitional Independent Living Plan (TILP) and determining the eligibility of applicants for the Supportive Transitional Emancipation Program (STEP).

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise was effective on January 1, 2002; however no counties have implemented the program.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: W&IC Section 11403.1
- There are no counties planning to participate in the program at this time.
- Trailer bill language limits participation in this program subject to the availability of funds in the current Budget Act.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

There are no counties planning to participate in the program at this time.

### **FUNDING:**

There are no counties planning to participate in the program at this time.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

There is no change.



## Supportive Transitional Emancipation Program

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

<b>101 – Assistance Payments – STEP</b>	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

<b>Item 141 – STEP Eligibility</b>	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.,
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

<b>Item 151 – STEP Plan Activity</b>	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## Emergency Assistance Program

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the Emergency Assistance (EA) Foster Care (FC) and General Assistance (GA) Programs, which provide funding for benefits and services granted to children and families in emergency situations. Eligibility is restricted to one episode in any 12-month period. The EA-FC Welfare Program provides support payments for dependents and voluntary FC placements not otherwise eligible for federal Title IV-E benefits. The "Child Welfare Services-Emergency Assistance" premise discusses additional program components.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193 eliminated Title IV-A funding for the EA Program but permitted use of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) dollars for EA funding. Although P.L. 104-193 allowed TANF funding for this portion of the EA Program, the Budget Act of 1997 replaced the TANF funding with State General Fund (GF). Based on interpretation of the final TANF regulations, that EA GF expenditures are not countable towards the TANF maintenance of effort requirement, effective October 1, 1999, the GF was replaced with TANF funding.

The EA-GA Program provides funding for qualified aliens and other cases that do not qualify for federal or state FC. Only those "qualified aliens" who entered the country before August 22, 1996, are eligible for TANF-funded services.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The EA-FC Welfare Program became effective September 1, 1993.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 10101.
- Based on actual expenditure and caseload data through December 2005, the projected average grant for EA-FC cases is \$1,409.65, and the projected average grant for EA-GA cases is \$1,969.34.
- EA casemonths are projected using a 24-month linear trend forecast based on actual caseload data. EA-FC and EA-GA caseloads are projected separately.
- EA administrative costs were adjusted for projected caseload growth.
- Foster children receiving EA benefits are eligible to receive the \$100 supplemental clothing allowance.

### METHODOLOGY:

- **Item 101** – EA-FC and EA-GA costs are the product of projected casemonths and the computed average grant, plus the cost of the supplemental clothing allowance for each case.
- **Item 141** - Costs for administrative activities performed by county welfare department staff are based upon actual expenditures and adjusted for caseload growth in both Fiscal Years (FYs) 2005-06 and 2006-07. Administrative costs also include \$35,000 for reimbursements to the California Department of Health Services for data processing activities associated with the Assistance to Children in Emergency System, which enables tracking of EA cases currently receiving assistance.

## Emergency Assistance Program

### FUNDING:

EA funding was used in the TANF block grant calculation and, therefore, is part of the TANF funding schedule.

Effective October 1, 1999, the EA-FC component is funded 70 percent TANF, 30 percent county; the EA-GA component is funded 50 percent TANF, 50 percent county; and, the EA administrative costs are funded 85 percent TANF and 15 percent county.

The supplemental clothing allowance component is funded 100 percent with TANF.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year increase reflects a higher caseload and higher average grant than projected for the Governor's Budget. The EA administrative costs for FY 2005-06 were held to appropriation.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year increase in EA grant costs reflects a slight decline in caseload. The EA administrative costs for FY 2006-07 were updated based on actual data.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly Caseload	3,347	3,293

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEMS 101 & 141 – EA	2005-06		2006-07	
	Grant	County Admin.	Grant	County Admin.
Total	\$57,145	\$5,260	\$56,218	\$4,997
Federal	39,969	4,476	39,319	4,253
State	0	0	0	0
County	17,176	784	16,899	744
Reimbursements	0	0	0	0

## **Title IV-E Disallowance**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

The Title IV-E Disallowance represents Title IV-E foster care funds that were withheld by the federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) for relative cases until the State could prove what percentage of relative homes met the required approval standards. To resolve the Disallowance, California was required to complete a review of 150 relative cases to determine the number that were in or out of compliance and extrapolate the results statewide. In return, the DHHS agreed to pay all federal claims for calendar year 2003. The review was completed and the final report was sent to DHHS Region IX on August 8, 2005. Region IX issued a final disallowance letter dated September 27, 2005, totaling \$33.8 million.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented with the September 2005 quarterly claim payment paid in December 2005.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

The disallowance will be repaid by offsetting the quarterly federal Title IV-E claim starting with the December 2005 claim.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The estimate is based on the amount in the final disallowance letter from DHHS Region IX.

### **FUNDING:**

The reduction in federal funds will be paid with State General Fund.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

Three quarters of the repayment will be reflected in the current year and one quarter in the budget year.

## Title IV-E Disallowance

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEM 101	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	-25,334	-8,445
State	25,334	8,445
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Title IV-E Foster Parent Child Care Program**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise provides the state the budgetary authority to pass through federal Title IV-E funds to counties for the implementation of a child care program for foster parents. Senate Bill 1612 (Chapter 845, Statutes of 2004) permits the pass through of federal Title IV-E funds, subject to federal approval, for the purpose of implementing a child care program in participating counties. There will be no State General Fund (GF) participation, and the 50 percent match will be provided by participating counties. Under Title IV-E foster care maintenance costs, states have the option to offer subsidized child care to foster parents when the need is related to non-ordinary parental duties such as foster parents work and school activities outside the home. On March 17, 2005, the Federal Department of Health and Human Services provided a policy clarification that allows states to implement a child care program, in some or all jurisdictions of the state and a State Plan Amendment is not necessary to implement this maintenance payment option.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise will be implemented on July 1, 2005.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Title IV-E is a federal funding source for children placed in out-of-home care who are eligible to receive Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care (AFDC-FC). Title IV-E funds provide the state and counties with matching funds for out-of-home placement costs, e.g. foster care which now includes child care. Federal financial participation is available at the Federal Medical Assistance Payment (FMAP) rate of 50 percent. Counties will be responsible for providing the 50 percent match.
- Although full county participation has not been established, this premise assumes San Francisco, Santa Clara, and San Mateo counties, who currently provide child care reimbursement to foster parents, will participate.
- These counties will be allowed to claim retroactively for eligible child care costs.
- The participating counties will request retroactive payments for Fiscal Year (FY) 2003-04 and FY 2004-05 to be claimed in FY 2005-06 based on the same methodology as the budget year. The retroactive amount for 6 months in FY 2003-04 is estimated to be \$2,935,085 total, \$1,467,542 federal and \$1,467,543 county share. The retroactive amount for FY 2004-05 is estimated to be \$6,366,390 total, \$3,183,195 federal and \$3,183,195 county share.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

To estimate the cost, the statewide monthly caseload was multiplied by the percent of childcare cases in the participating counties and multiplied by the counties share of statewide cases. The product was then multiplied by the average monthly CalWORK's Child Care Stage One reimbursement, and then multiplied by 12 months.

- The participating counties currently fund child care in 39.4 percent of their federal Foster Family Home (FFH) cases. The federal FFH eligible caseload in these counties is 6.6 percent of the total statewide monthly caseload.

## Title IV-E Foster Parent Child Care Program

### METHODOLOGY (continued):

- The monthly CalWORK's Child Care Stage One reimbursement including the California Necessities Index and administration cost is \$690.80 for FY 2005-06 and \$626.28 for FY 2006-07.

### FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 50 percent federal funds, 50 percent county funds. There is no State General Fund share.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The change is due to a slight increase in the caseload and the Child Care Stage One reimbursement for current year (CY).

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The CY contains retroactive payments for FY 2003-04 and FY 2004-05, while budget year is annualized.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$16,140	\$6,134
Federal	8,070	3,067
State	0	0
County	8,070	3,067
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## Foster Care Infant Rate (SB 500)

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with the implementation of SB 500 (Chapter 630, Statutes of 2005). SB 500 makes changes in the way foster care providers are paid for teen parents in placement with their child. It allows for a separate full foster care payment to be paid for the care of a child living in the same foster care facility as that child's minor parent, provided federal financial participation is available and both the child and parent are dependents of the court and receiving reunification services. It creates a new placement option called "whole family foster home", in which care and supervision are provided to dependent teen parents and their non-court dependent children, to ensure the teen parents develop skills necessary to provide a safe, stable, and permanent home for their children. It requires the development of a written "shared responsibility plan" to be created by the foster caregiver and the teen parent in a whole family foster home, and would provide a \$200 monthly payment above the current infant supplement for the added care and supervision provided by the foster caregiver to the teen parent and child, pursuant to the shared responsibility plan.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented January 1, 2006.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The estimated number of teen moms who are in placement with their children is 408.
- The estimated number of non-dependent infant cases is 265.
- The average grant for Group Homes is \$4,993.55 with a current infant supplement rate of \$848. The Foster Family Agency average grant is \$1,710.14 with a current infant supplement rate of \$391. The Foster Family Homes grant is \$597 for teens and \$425 for age 0-4, with a current infant supplement rate of \$391.
- It is assumed that an additional two hours of social time would be required to develop the written "shared responsibility plan."
- The social worker cost per hour is \$72.60.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The increased costs are associated with the full foster care payment for dependent infants, and the additional \$200 above the infant supplemental rate for non-dependent infants.
- The increased costs associated with increased placements of infants with teen parents are the increased grants for the dependent infant moving them to match the teen parent's placement.
- Costs for the additional social worker time are calculated by multiplying two hours by the number of non-dependent infant cases by the social worker cost per hour.



## Foster Care Infant Rate (SB 500)

### FUNDING:

#### Item 101

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of Federal Financial Participation based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage for those cases meeting eligibility criteria. Funding for the nonfederal program and the nonfederal share of federal program costs is 40 percent State General Fund (GF) and 60 percent county.

#### Item 151

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent, costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The current year reflects 6 months of costs and the budget year reflects a full year of costs.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEM 101 – FC Payments		2005-06	2006-07
		Grant	Grant
Total		\$592	\$1,184
Federal		222	444
State		148	296
County		222	444
Reimbursements		0	0
ITEM 151 – Child Welfare Services		2005-06	2006-07
		County Admin.	County Admin.
Total		\$19	\$38
Federal		7	14
State		8	17
County		4	7
Reimbursements		0	0

## **Adoption Assistance Program – Basic Costs**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the basic cost of providing financial support to families adopting a child with special needs under the Adoption Assistance Program (AAP).

Children eligible for AAP benefits have one of the following characteristics that are barriers to adoption: mental, physical, medical or emotional handicap; ethnic background, race, color, or language; over three years of age; member of a sibling group to be adopted by one family; or adverse parental background (e.g., drug addiction, mental illness). To be eligible to receive federal benefits, the child shall have been otherwise eligible to receive aid under the federal Aid to Families with Dependent Children-Foster Care Program. The amount of the AAP payment is based on the child's needs and the prospective family's circumstances, with eligibility reassessed every two years. Pursuant to Assembly Bill 390 (Chapter 547, Statutes of 2000), the statewide median income guideline shall not be used for negotiations between the prospective adoptive family and the adoption agency to determine the amount of the payment to be received.

The AAP benefit shall not exceed the age-related, foster family home care rate for which the child would otherwise be eligible. The AAP payment may include the value of a specialized care increment that would have been paid on behalf of a child due to health and/or behavioral problems. Payments may continue until the child attains the age of 18 unless a mental or physical handicap warrants the continuation of assistance until the child reaches the age of 21.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16115 through 16123.
- Cases presumed to be eligible for the federal AAP make up 86.8 percent of the total AAP payment caseload, based on data through December 2005 as reported on the CA 800 claim forms.
- Caseload and expenditure data extracted from the CA 800 provide the basis for caseload and average grant projections.
- The federal and nonfederal average grants are \$741.98 and \$798.82, respectively, for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and \$754.43 and \$802.45 for FY 2006-07, based on an 18-month linear trend analysis.
- The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

AAP basic costs are the product of projected federal and nonfederal casemonths and the respective average grant, as identified above.

## Adoption Assistance Program – Basic Costs

### FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for those cases meeting eligibility criteria, with the amount of FFP based on the FMAP rate. Federal case costs ineligible for FFP and the costs of the nonfederal program are shared 75 percent State General Fund and 25 percent county.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year decline reflects a lower average grant than previously estimated.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year increase reflects continuing caseload growth and an increase in the average grant.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly Caseload	69,274	74,619

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$623,105	\$681,208
Federal	261,678	286,556
State	271,070	295,989
County	90,357	98,663
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Refugee Cash Assistance – Basic Costs**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs for the Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) Program. The RCA Program provides cash grants to refugees during their first eight months in the United States (U.S.) if they are not otherwise eligible for other categorical welfare programs.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

Section 1522 of Title 8 of the United States Code (U.S.C.) authorizes the federal government to provide grants to the states to assist refugees who resettle in the U.S.

Sections 13275 through 13282 of the Welfare and Institutions Code authorize the Department to administer the funds provided under Title 8 of the U.S.C. It also provides the Department authority to allocate the federal funds to the counties.

The average grant cost for RCA recipients is \$299.72, which reflects actual expenditures through December 2005.

The average monthly caseload for FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 is estimated at 1,363 and 1,469 cases, respectively.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The RCA average grant is multiplied by the estimated caseload to arrive at total RCA costs for each fiscal year.

### **FUNDING:**

The program is 100 percent federally funded with the Cash, Medical and Administration Grant through the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

Current and budget year costs have increased due to a higher average monthly caseload than previously estimated.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

Total costs increase in FY 2006-07 due to projected caseload growth of 7.8 percent.

## Refugee Cash Assistance – Basic Costs

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$4,781	\$5,283
Federal	4,781	5,283
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Emergency Food Assistance Program Fund

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects expenditures from contributions designated on state income tax returns for the Emergency Food Assistance Program (EFAP). Assembly Bill 2366 (Chapter 818, Statutes of 1998) established an EFAP fund which, upon appropriation by the Legislature, is allocated to the State Franchise Tax Board (FTB) and State Controller's Office for reimbursement for their costs associated with administering the fund. The balance of the fund is directed to the California Department of Social Services for allocation to the EFAP.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Revenue and Taxation Code Sections 18851 through 18855.
- The current year reflects the actual amount of contributions made to the EFAP fund available in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 plus unexpended funds that were allocated in FY 2004-05.
- The budget year estimate reflects the estimated amount of contributions to be made to the EFAP fund from June 2005 through May 2006 of \$425,475, unexpended funds of \$8,983 from prior years, and estimated interest of \$20,000.
- The estimated annual administrative costs for the FTB, State Controller's Office, and statewide general administrative (pro rata) costs are \$6,829 in the current year and \$6,124 in the budget year.
- These funds are provided to supplement, and not supplant, existing program funds.

### METHODOLOGY:

The current year reflects the actual amount available for expenditure in FY 2005-06. The budget year reflects the estimated amount of contributions to the EFAP fund in the state income tax year, plus accrued interest, less the annual administrative costs for the FTB, the State Controller's Office, and statewide general administrative (pro rata) costs.

### FUNDING:

The costs are 100 percent from the EFAP fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

This premise has been updated for more actual data.

## Emergency Food Assistance Program Fund

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise has been updated for more actual data.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$432	\$448
Federal	0	0
State	432	448
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## California Food Assistance Program

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the coupon and administrative costs associated with the California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) for eligible noncitizens. The Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, Public Law (P.L.) 104-193, provided that legal noncitizens who entered the United States (U.S.) on or after August 22, 1996, were ineligible for federal food stamp benefits unless they were exempt under certain refugee categories. Federal food stamp benefits for the ineligible legal noncitizens were terminated in August 1997. The CFAP serves legal noncitizens over 18 and under 65 years of age, who were legally in the U.S. prior to August 22, 1996, and met all federal food stamp eligibility criteria except for their immigration status and legal noncitizens that entered the country on or after August 22, 1996, and are otherwise eligible.

The Food Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2002 (H.R. 2646 Farm Bill) restored federal food stamp eligibility to legal noncitizens who are disabled, effective October 2002, noncitizens who have been in the U.S. for five years or more, effective April 2003, and all noncitizen children, effective October 2003.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise originally implemented on September 1, 1997.

The H.R. 2646 Farm Bill implemented on October 1, 2002.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 18930.
- It is assumed that the trend in the total number of CFAP recipients resembles the monthly fluctuations in the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) and Non-Assistance Food Stamp (NAFS) trend forecasts.
- The total number of CFAP recipients is projected by applying the CalWORKs and NAFS trend forecast to January 2006 actual recipients.
- The projected average monthly number of CFAP recipients is 19,407 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, and 20,347 in FY 2006-07.
- The projected average monthly number of CFAP households is 7,921 in FY 2005-06 and 8,333 in FY 2006-07.
- Based on actual data reported from the counties for January 2006, the average coupon value per person is \$92.60. Effective October 1, 2006, a cost-of-living adjustment is applied increasing the average coupon value per person to \$94.00.
- The average monthly administrative cost per case is \$25.01.
- The processing fee charged by FNS for electronic benefit transfer (EBT) is \$314 per \$1 million.
- The ratio between public assistance (PA) and nonassistance (NA) is 24.40 percent PA and 75.60 percent NA.



## California Food Assistance Program

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- The PA costs are considered eligible expenditures for the State's maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement. The NA costs are not considered MOE eligible.

### METHODOLOGY

- The coupon costs are calculated by multiplying the average coupon value per person by the projected monthly number of recipients. The processing fees are included in the annual coupon costs.
- Administrative costs are calculated by multiplying the average administrative cost per case by the projected monthly number of cases.

### FUNDING:

The expenditures are State General Fund (GF) only. The PA portion of the costs is eligible to be counted towards the MOE requirement.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year and budget year increase reflects the net result of a caseload decrease offset by an increase in average coupon per person.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in the budget year reflects caseload growth.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly Number of Recipients	19,407	20,347

## California Food Assistance Program

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06		2006-07	
	Coupon	County Admin.	Coupon	County Admin.
Total	\$20,264	\$2,377	\$22,773	\$2,490
Federal	0	0	0	0
State	20,264	2,377	22,773	2,490
County	0	0	0	0
Reimbursement	0	0	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

---

## Standard Utility Allowance Adjustment

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects an increase in coupon costs in the California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) as a result of an increase in the Standard Utility Allowance (SUA) effective August 2006. The SUA is part of the shelter deduction calculation in the food stamp budget worksheet that determines the monthly coupon allotment. The SUA is routinely updated each October to reflect any changes in the cost of living based on the California Consumer Price Index (CPI). However, due to recent increases in energy costs, the California Department of Social Services is proposing to update the SUA two months earlier in the month of August.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will be implemented on August 1, 2006.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 18901.
- The SUA will increase from the October 1, 2005 level of \$223 to \$271 effective August 1, 2006.
- This estimate assumes additional CFAP coupon costs as a result of the increase in the SUA for August 2006 and September 2006. The costs for October 2006 through June 2007 are reflected in the CFAP Basic. There will not be an additional SUA adjustment on October 1, 2006.
- In accordance with Food Stamp regulations, Manual of Policy and Procedures (MPP) 63.502.363(d), the SUA adjustment was based on the Fuel and Other Utilities Index of the CPI-Utility released by the United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), for the Greater Los Angeles and San Francisco statistical metropolitan areas. The statewide weighted index change for Fuel and Other Utilities from March 2005 to March 2006 is 21.7 percent, which was applied to the October 1, 2005 SUA level of \$223.
- The SUA is not claimed by households for various reasons. These include: (1) many rental agreements incorporate the cost of utilities into the monthly rent and are not separated by rent and utilities; (2) households may claim actual utility expenses by providing documentation; and, (3) the SUA may not be claimed if a homeless shelter deduction is claimed. Based on Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2004 Q5 survey data, 64.14 percent claimed the SUA. Effective October 2006, the mandatory SUA implements and an additional 0.02 percent of cases will receive the increase. 1.3 percent of cases claim actual utility expenses; of the 1.3 percent, 0.02 percent is eligible for the SUA.
- The \$48 increase in the SUA results in a corresponding decrease in the net monthly income when calculating the household's food stamp allotment. The food stamp coupon allotment to household income is approximately \$1 in coupon for every \$3 in income. As a result, eligible households will see an increase of approximately \$16 in food stamp coupons.
- The average monthly number of CFAP households for August 2006 and September 2006 is 8,186.

## Standard Utility Allowance Adjustment

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- The ratio between non-assistance (NA) and public assistance (PA) is 75.60 percent NA and 24.40 percent PA.
- The PA costs are considered eligible expenditures for the State's maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement. The NA costs are not considered MOE eligible.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The number of CFAP households affected by the increase in the SUA is calculated by multiplying the projected monthly number of CFAP households for August 2006 and September 2006, by the percent of cases claiming the SUA (64.14 percent). Effective October 2006, the mandatory SUA implements and an additional 0.02 percent of cases will receive the increase. The average monthly number of CFAP households affected by the increase in the SUA is 5,251.
- The monthly number of CFAP households affected by the increase in the SUA is multiplied by the average increase in coupons (\$16.19).

### FUNDING:

These expenditures are 100 percent State General Fund. The PA portion of the costs is eligible to be counted towards the MOE requirement.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

This is a new premise.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise will be implemented in the budget year.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$170
Federal	0	0
State	0	170
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## SSI/SSP – Basic Costs

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the basic costs for the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Program. The SSI Program, authorized by Title XVI of the Social Security Act, replaced the prior federal/state matching grant program of adult assistance to the aged, blind, and disabled in January 1974. The SSI/SSP Program is a cash assistance program for low-income aged, blind, and disabled persons. California opted to supplement the SSI payments, creating the SSP Program. The Social Security Administration (SSA) administers the SSI/SSP Program at California's option.

The maximum amount of aid is dependent on the following factors:

Whether one is aged, blind, or disabled;

The living arrangement;

Marital status; and,

Minor status.

As a result of the various factors determining the maximum amount of aid, there are 19 different payment standards in the SSI/SSP Program.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The SSA will continue to administer the program under Title XVI of the Social Security Act.

Section 1611 of Title XVI defines the amount of SSI benefits an individual may be eligible to receive.

Section 12200 of the Welfare and Institutions Code defines the maximum payment standard available under each living arrangement.

The basic costs per case for SSI and SSP estimates are developed from actual state and federal expenditures reported on the State Data Exchange (SDX) and SSA 8700 reports. The SSI and SSP average basic grants, based on actual data through November 2005, are as follows:

	<u>SSI</u>	<u>SSP</u>
Aged	\$276.16	\$229.49
Blind	341.18	285.67
Disabled	374.77	229.75

### METHODOLOGY:

The SSI/SSP basic costs are computed for each aged, blind, and disabled component, then summed to produce total basic costs. Both the SSI and SSP basic average grants were adjusted to exclude the effects of payments to recipients residing in medical facilities. The adjusted average grants were multiplied by the estimated caseloads to arrive at an adjusted basic cost. Estimated expenditures for recipients in medical facilities were then added to total basic costs.

## SSI/SSP – Basic Costs

### FUNDING:

The SSI portion of the program is funded with 100 percent federal Title XVI funds, and the SSP portion is funded with 100 percent State General Fund. Costs for each component are computed separately.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

Total costs decreased due to a lower average grant and slightly lower monthly caseload than previously estimated. In addition, the impact of the April 2005 cost-of-living adjustment is now included in the basic costs.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Expenditures increase in the budget year due to caseload growth.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly Persons	1,212,665	1,241,554

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$8,283,414	\$8,483,502
Federal	4,949,255	5,085,871
State	3,334,159	3,397,631
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## SSI/SSP – January 2006 COLA

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the impact of cost-of-living adjustments (COLAs) given to Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Program recipients effective January 1, 2006. The SSI Consumer Price Index (CPI) COLA of 4.1 percent will not be passed through to recipients until April 1, 2006, resulting in an increase in the SSI portion of the grant payment and an equal decrease in the SSP portion of the grant payment on January 1, 2006. The California Necessities Index (CNI) of 4.07 percent was suspended.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2006.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Section 1617 of Title XVI of the Social Security Act authorizes the COLA for SSI recipients.
- Section 12201 of the Welfare and Institutions Code authorizes the COLA for SSP recipients.
- The State COLA based on the CNI is 4.07 percent for 2006 and was suspended.
- The CPI is 4.1 percent for 2006, and will not be passed through to recipients until April 1, 2006.
- The Non-Medical Out-of-Home Care, Restaurant Meals Allowance, and Title XIX payment standard categories are exempt from the payment standard reduction.
- General Fund (GF) savings to the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (\$0.6 million), California Veterans Cash Benefit Program (\$0.1 million), and SSP Administration (\$0.1 million) are included in total savings.
- A \$1 million administration fee is charged by the Social Security Administration for changing payment standards in a month other than January. This fee is netted against total savings.
- As a result of the delay in passing through the federal COLA until April 1, 2006, 4,583 SSI/SSP recipients will lose eligibility for three months.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The SSI and SSP average grants change as a result of the COLA. The CPI is applied to the 2005 SSI payment standards and the result is the new SSI payment standards for 2006.
- The SSP payment standards decrease as a result of not passing-through the federal COLA. The new 2006 SSI payment standard is subtracted from the total 2005 payment standards; the result is the new reduced SSP payment standard.
- The new payment standards are used in a statistical model to determine a change to the basic SSI/SSP average grant due to the COLAs. The change in average grant is multiplied by the caseload and the result is the change to the SSI/SSP Program for the January 2006 COLA.



## SSI/SSP – January 2006 COLA

### FUNDING:

The SSI portion of the program is funded with 100 percent federal Title XVI funds, and the SSP portion is funded with 100 percent GF. Each component is costed separately.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

GF savings have decreased slightly due slightly lower average monthly caseload.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year reflects the full-year impact of the federal COLA. No GF savings are realized since SSP payment standards are returned to their value before the reduction on April 1, 2006.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's):

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$33,884	\$238,418
Federal	112,147	238,418
State	-78,263	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## SSI/SSP – January 2007 COLA

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the impact of cost-of-living adjustments (COLAs) given to Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Program recipients effective January 1, 2007. The estimated SSI Consumer Price Index (CPI) COLA of 2.1 percent will not be passed through to recipients until April 1, 2007, resulting in an increase in the SSI portion of the grant payment and an equal decrease in the SSP portion of the grant payment on January 1, 2007. The California Necessities Index (CNI) of 3.75 percent will be suspended.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implements on January 1, 2007.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Section 1617 of Title XVI of the Social Security Act authorizes the COLA for SSI recipients.
- Section 12201 of the Welfare and Institutions Code authorizes the COLA for SSP recipients.
- The State COLA based on the CNI is 3.75 percent for 2007 and will be suspended.
- The CPI is estimated at 2.1 percent for 2007, and will not be passed through to recipients until April 1, 2007.
- The Non-Medical Out-of-Home Care, Restaurant Meals Allowance, and Title XIX payment standard categories are exempt from the payment standard reduction.
- General Fund (GF) savings to the Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (\$0.3 million), California Veterans Cash Benefit Program (\$0.1 million), and SSP Administration (\$0.1 million) are included in total savings.
- A \$1 million administration fee is charged by the Social Security Administration for changing payment standards in a month other than January. This fee is netted against total savings.
- As a result of not passing through the federal COLA until April 1, 2007, 2,482 SSI/SSP recipients will lose eligibility for three months in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The SSI and SSP average grants change as a result of the COLA. The CPI is applied to the 2006 SSI payment standards and the result is the new SSI payment standards for 2007.
- The SSP payment standards decrease as a result of not passing-through the federal COLA. The new 2007 SSI payment standard is subtracted from the total 2006 payment standards; the result is the new reduced SSP payment standard.
- The new payment standards are used in a statistical model to determine a change to the basic SSI/SSP average grant due to the COLAs. The change in average grant is multiplied by the caseload and the result is the change to the SSI/SSP Program for the January 2007 COLA.

## SSI/SSP – January 2007 COLA

### FUNDING:

The SSI portion of the program is funded with 100 percent federal Title XVI funds, and the SSP portion is funded with 100 percent GF. Each component is costed separately.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

Federal costs have decreased due to the revised CPI forecast from 2.4 to 2.1 percent. GF savings have decreased due to the revised CPI, as well as the shortened COLA suspension from six to three months.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The COLA is not effective until January 1, 2007.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's):

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$17,861
Federal	0	60,893
State	0	-43,032
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## SSI/SSP – In-Kind Support Costs

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of providing payments to Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Program and Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI) recipients who will experience a reduction in their benefits as a result of not-passing through the federal COLA for three months in 2006 and 2007. The increase due to the SSI Consumer Price Index (CPI) COLA will be delayed from January until April 1, 2006 and until April 1, 2007, for the January 2007 COLA.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2006.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The CPI is 4.1 percent for 2006, and will not be passed through to recipients until April 1, 2006.
- The CPI is estimated at 2.1 percent for 2007, and will not be passed through to recipients until April 1, 2007.
- There are 31,808 SSI/SSP recipients who are in the Independent Living Arrangement category and are charged with unearned income in the form of in-kind support and maintenance. These recipients will experience a grant reduction of \$8 per month (\$24 over three months) in 2006. The reduction is estimated at \$4.33 per month (\$12.99 over three months) in 2007.
- There are 203 CAPI recipients who will be similarly impacted. These recipients are living independently but receive in-kind support. These recipients will experience the same reduction as SSI/SSP cases.
- The State Controller's Office cost to issue reimbursement payments is estimated at \$9.29 per check in 2006, and \$9.59 in 2007.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The grant cost was calculated by multiplying the applicable caseload by the three-month cost for each program in 2006 and 2007.
- The administration cost was calculated by multiplying the number of checks to be sent out by the cost per check (\$9.29 in 2006, \$9.59 in 2007).

### FUNDING:

All costs are 100 percent General Fund.

## SSI/SSP – In Kind Support Costs

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

Budget year costs have decreased due to the revised CPI forecast for 2007 from 2.4 to 2.1 percent as well as a shortened reimbursement period from six to three months.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year reflects a lower grant reimbursement amount of \$4.33 per month for three months.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's):

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$1,067	\$741
Federal	0	0
State	1,067	741
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **SSI/SSP – SSP Administration**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

The Social Security Administration (SSA) formerly administered the Supplemental Security Income/ State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Program benefit payments without charge to the states. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 shifted costs for administration of SSP to the State, effective October 1, 1993. It also provided for additional service fees to be charged if SSA provides services beyond the expected level, such as payment standard reductions or increases made on other than the normal January 1 schedule.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on October 1, 1993.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- The SSA will continue to administer this program under Title XVI of the Social Security Act.
- The federal Balanced Budget Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-33) amended existing federal statutes pertaining to the administration fees for SSP payments. For each federal fiscal year (FFY) from 1998 through 2002, administration fees increased from an initial \$5.00 per payment to \$8.50 per payment in FFY 2002. Increases after FFY 2002 are based on the Consumer Price Index (CPI).
- Effective October 1, 2005, the fee increased from \$9.06 to \$9.29, based on a 2.5 percent increase in the CPI from June of the current year compared to June of the previous year. Effective October 1, 2006, the fee is projected to increase to \$9.59 per payment.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The projected number of payments is based on the projected caseload plus the six-month moving average of the difference between the actual caseload and the number of payments. The projected number of payments is then multiplied by the respective cost per payment.

### **FUNDING:**

The administration costs consist of 100 percent State General Fund.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The current and budget year estimates have decreased slightly due to a lower average monthly caseload. .

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

Expenditures increase due to a higher average monthly caseload and in increase in the fee per payment from \$9.29 to \$9.59 on October 1, 2006.

## SSI/SSP – SSP Administration

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly Payments	1,229,587	1,258,511

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Admin	Admin
Total	\$136,234	143,707
Federal	0	0
State	136,234	143,707
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## California Veterans Cash Benefit Program

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of providing benefits at the same level as State Supplementary Payment (SSP) benefits to certain veterans of World War II who 1) return to the Republic of the Philippines and no longer have a place of residence in the state; and 2) were receiving SSP benefits on December 14, 1999. The California Veterans Cash Benefit (CVCB) payments are authorized under Assembly Bill 1978 (Chapter 143, Statutes of 2000).

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 19, 2000.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 12400.
- The grant costs associated with the implementation of this bill are the equivalent of SSP benefits the veterans would receive under the SSI/SSP Program.
- An average benefit payment of \$241.04 will be paid to eligible recipients in current and budget year.
- The Social Security Administration (SSA) administers the CVCB Program in conjunction with benefits under Title VIII of the federal Social Security Act.
- SSA charges a monthly administrative fee equivalent to the SSP administrative fee per payment of \$9.29. The ongoing administrative fee will increase to \$9.59 on October 1, 2006.
- The average monthly number of participating veterans is 1,821 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, and 1,842 in FY 2006-07.

### METHODOLOGY:

The cost of the program is estimated by multiplying the number of participating veterans by the benefit and administrative costs per case.

### FUNDING:

This program is funded 100 percent with GF.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The estimate has decreased due to a lower average monthly caseload and average grant than previously estimated.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Total program costs increase slightly in FY 2006-07 due to a small increase in the average monthly caseload.



## California Veterans Cash Benefit Program

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06 Grant/ Administration	2006-07 Grant/ Administration
<b>CVCB Costs</b>		
Total	\$5,469	\$5,538
Federal	0	0
State	5,469	5,538
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## SSI/SSP – Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (S. 1392)

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the impact of the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 on the Supplemental Security Income (SSI)/State Supplementary Payment (SSP) Program. The provisions of the bill affecting SSI/SSP recipients include, 1) Additional eligibility reviews by the Social Security Administration (SSA) of SSI disability allowances, and 2) Lump sum retroactive payment limits of no more than three months worth of benefits. Both provisions will result in savings to the SSI/SSP Program.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on March 1, 2006.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

#### Pre-Effectuation Reviews

- Beginning March 1, 2006, 25 percent of SSI disability allowances will be reviewed by SSA. Starting October 1, 2006, 50 percent of disability allowances will be reviewed.
- Based on State Data Exchange (SDX) data through February 2006, the average number of allowances is 15,616 cases each month.
- Statistical data from the Disability Evaluation Division reflect approximately 1 percent of all allowances are returned due to decisional errors.
- In Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, 156 cases will be returned as ineligible. In FY 2006-07, 820 cases will be returned as ineligible.
- The average monthly SSI/SSP grant savings per returned case is \$628.52. The average administrative cost per case per month saved is \$9.29 and increases to \$9.59 on October 1, 2006.

#### Lump Sum Retroactive Payments

- Lump sum retroactive payments will be limited to no more than three months' worth of benefits per installment effective June 1, 2006. Prior to the change, up to 12 months' worth of benefits were payable per installment.
- Retroactive payments are paid in a maximum of three installments.
- Based on SDX data through January 2006, there are 3,459 cases per month entitled to receive retroactive benefits in amounts greater than three times the SSI/SSP maximum grant.
- Due to the new payment schedule, there will be an increase in the number of checks sent to recipients, resulting in an administrative charge of \$9.29 per additional payment.

## SSI/SSP – Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 (S. 1392)

### METHODOLOGY:

- For savings attributable to the pre-effectuation reviews, the number of cases forecasted to be returned as ineligible was multiplied by the average SSI/SSP grant and administrative cost per case.
- For savings due to the change in retroactive payments, the level of payments prior to the change was compared to the new payment schedule, with the difference reflecting the savings. Over time, the same amount of benefits will be paid, just over a longer period of time.

### FUNDING:

The SSI portion of the program is funded with 100 percent federal Title XVI funds, and the SSP portion is funded with 100 percent GF. Each component is costed separately.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

This is a new premise.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The impact of the additional pre-effectuation reviews will not be reflected until March 2006. The impact due to the change in the schedule of retroactive payments will not take effect until June 2006.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's):

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	-\$9,046	-\$79,923
Federal	-6,688	-59,033
State	-2,358	-20,890
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI)**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs to implement the CAPI Program. The CAPI Program provides benefits to aged, blind, and disabled legal immigrants who successfully complete an application process. The benefits received are equivalent to those benefits that these immigrants would have received if they were eligible for the Supplemental Security Income and/or State Supplemental Payment (SSI/SSP) Program, less \$10 per individual and \$20 per couple. This premise includes costs for both the grant and administrative costs necessary for implementation.

CAPI recipients in the base program include the following immigrants: 1) those who entered the United States (U.S.) prior to August 22, 1996, and are not eligible for SSI/SSP benefits solely due to their immigration status; and 2) those who entered the U.S. on or after August 22, 1996, but meet special sponsor restrictions (have a sponsor who is disabled, deceased, or abusive). The extended CAPI caseload includes immigrants who entered the U.S. on or after August 22, 1996, who do not have a sponsor or have a sponsor who does not meet the sponsor restrictions of the base program.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on October 1, 1998.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Chapter 10.3 of the W&IC gives the California Department of Social Services the authority to administer the CAPI Program.
- Section 18940 of the W&IC states that the CAPI Program will be governed by the same federal and state regulations which govern the SSI/SSP Program.
- Section 18941 of the W&IC authorizes benefits paid under CAPI to be equivalent to benefits provided under the SSI/SSP Program, except that the schedule for individuals and couples shall be reduced \$10 per individual and \$20 per couple per month.
- Although CAPI was originally due to sunset on July 1, 2000, Assembly Bill (AB) 1111 (Chapter 147, Statutes of 1999) extended the base program indefinitely.
- AB 1111 also created time-limited CAPI eligibility from October 1, 1999, through September 30, 2000, for immigrants who entered the country on or after August 22, 1996. This bill established a five-year deeming period for these cases. AB 2876 extended time-limited CAPI for one more year through September 30, 2001. AB 429 (Chapter 111, Statutes of 2001) eliminated the sunset date for the time-limited ("extended") program altogether, and lengthened the deeming period to ten years.
- The Governor's Budget extends the current statutory sponsor deeming period for another five years. Aged, blind or disabled legal noncitizens eligible for financial assistance are sometimes required to have sponsors, and are deemed to have their sponsor's income and resources which eliminates benefits for otherwise eligible applicants.
- The average monthly number of total CAPI cases will be 7,991 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, and 7,728 in FY 2006-07.

## Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI)

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- The average monthly grant is \$614.71 for the Base CAPI cases, based on actual expenditures through September 2005. The average grant will increase due to a 4.1 percent federal cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) effective January 1, 2006. The average Base CAPI grant will also increase on January 1, 2007, to reflect a 2.1 federal COLA. The impact of not-passing through the COLAs is reflected in the "January 2006 COLA" and "January 2007 COLA" premise descriptions.
- The average monthly grant is \$762.96 for the Extended CAPI cases, based on actual expenditures through September 2005. The average grant will change as discussed above for the Base CAPI cases.
- The average monthly administrative cost per case for FY 2005-06 of \$126.90 is based on actual expenditures through September 2005. For FY 2006-07, the average administrative cost per case will remain unchanged.

### METHODOLOGY:

Base CAPI program costs are estimated by multiplying the projected monthly caseload by the Base CAPI average grant and administrative cost per case. Extended CAPI costs are estimated by multiplying the Extended CAPI caseload by the Extended CAPI average grant and administrative cost per case. Base CAPI and extended CAPI costs are then added to determine total CAPI Program costs.

### FUNDING:

The program is funded with 100 percent GF.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The estimate has increased due to a higher average monthly caseload and average grant in the Extended program.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

CAPI costs decrease due to a lower average monthly caseload in the Base program.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
Total CAPI		
Total	\$81,489	\$80,781
Federal	0	0
State	81,489	80,781
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Cash Assistance Program for Immigrants (CAPI)

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
Base CAPI		
Total	\$34,708	\$23,749
Federal	0	0
State	34,708	23,749
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
Extended CAPI		
Total	\$46,781	\$57,032
Federal	0	0
State	46,781	57,032
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

---

## **Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS**

### **SSP MOE Eligible**

#### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the State Supplementary Payment (SSP) expenditures countable towards the State Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program maintenance of effort (MOE). More specifically, the increase in SSP expenditures for disabled SSP children in California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) families since the inception of the TANF Program is considered countable as MOE.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193, the federal welfare reform legislation, established the TANF Program and a TANF block grant to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) Program. States must meet an 80 percent MOE to receive their full block grant allocation. The MOE is reduced to 75 percent for states that meet the work participation rate requirement. For California, the amount of the MOE is based on state and county expenditures in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1994. The State has consistently met its work participation agreement, therefore the MOE level is lowered from \$2.9 billion (80 percent) to \$2.7 billion, which constitutes 75 percent of the 1994 level.

The State may count both local and state expenditures made by CDSS or other departments on behalf of TANF/CalWORKs-eligible families toward the MOE. If these expenditures would have been authorized and allowable under the former AFDC, JOBS, Child Care for AFDC recipients, At-Risk Child Care or Transitional Child Care programs in FFY 1995, the entire expenditures may count toward the MOE. However, if such expenditures were not previously authorized and allowable, countable expenditures are limited to the amount by which allowable current year expenditures exceed the total State program expenditures in FFY 1995. State expenditures that are used as a match to draw down other federal funding are generally not countable toward the TANF MOE.

#### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on January 1, 2003.

#### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: 45 Code of Federal Regulations section 263.2.
- The average number of SSP children living in a CalWORKs household for July through Oct 2005 was 9,418, or 12.15 percent of total SSP children living with relatives.
- SSP expenditures for SSP children living with relatives were \$52.8 million in 1995. SSP expenditures for the same population are estimated at \$129.8 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06.
- The SSP payment standard decreased on January 1, 2006, from \$119 to \$95 due to the no-pass of the federal cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) and suspension of the State COLA. The SSP payment standard will return to \$119 on April 1, 2006. The SSP payment standard for disabled children is projected to decrease on January 1, 2007, to \$106 due to not-passing through the federal COLA and suspension of the State COLA. The SSP payment standard will return to \$119 on April 1, 2007.



## **Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS SSP MOE Eligible**

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (CONTINUED)**

- The projected expenditures for SSP children living in a CalWORKs household for FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 will be \$15.8 and \$16.5 million, respectively.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

- Expenditures for SSP children living in a CalWORKs household in 1995 is estimated at \$8.5 million.
- Expenditures for FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 are forecasted based on the increase or decrease in the SSP payment standard from year to year. For FY 2005-06, the SSP payment standard will decrease by 3.0 percent. For FY 2006-07, the SSP payment standard is projected to increase by 2.4 percent.
- The percentage of SSP children living in a CalWORKs household (12.15 percent) is multiplied by the estimated SSP expenditures for each fiscal year to arrive at expenditures attributable to SSP children living in a CalWORKs household. For FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07, SSP expenditures for this population are estimated at \$15.8 and \$16.5 million, respectively.
- For FY 2005-06, the amount by which allowable current year expenditures exceed the total State program expenditures in 1995 is \$7.3 million (\$15.8 - \$8.5 million).
- For FY 2006-07, the amount by which allowable SSP expenditures will exceed the total State program expenditures in 1995 is \$8.0 million (\$16.5 - \$8.5 million).

### **FUNDING:**

The SSP expenditures are funded with 100 percent State General Fund.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

Due to a lower percentage of SSP children living with relatives in a CalWORKs household than previously estimated, the estimated level of countable SSP expenditures has decreased.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The level of MOE-eligible expenditures increases due to projected caseload growth and an increase in the SSP grant due to the pass-through of the federal COLA on April 1, 2007.

## **Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS SSP MOE Eligible**

### **EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$7,256	\$8,027
Federal	0	0
State	7,256	8,027
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

---

## Personal Care Services Program/Residual IHSS Basic Costs

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the basic costs for the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Program. Assembly Bill (AB) 1773 (Chapter 939, Statutes of 1992) required the California Department of Health Services to submit a Medicaid state plan amendment to the federal Health Care Financing Administration to include a portion of the IHSS Program as a Title XIX eligible service. This portion of the IHSS Program is known as the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP). A Residual Program provides for services on behalf of individuals who are not eligible for PCSP.

The IHSS Program enables eligible individuals to remain safely in their own homes as an alternative to out-of-home care. Eligible recipients are aged, blind or disabled individuals who receive public assistance or have low incomes.

AB 925 (Chapter 1088, statutes of 2002) allows recipients to utilize authorized personal care services in locations outside of the home, including their place of employment, as authorized by the Director. Services and service hours remain limited to those authorized for the recipient in their own home.

The following services are PCSP-eligible services:

- Domestic services such as meal preparation, laundry, shopping, and errands;
- Non-medical personal care services;
- Assistance while traveling to medical appointments or to other sources of supportive services;
- Teaching and demonstration directed at reducing the need for supportive services; and,
- Certain paramedical services ordered by a physician.

The Residual Program provides services to recipients who are not eligible for PCSP. The Residual Program cases include the following:

- Cases requiring protective supervision tasks;
- Cases with domestic services only;
- Cases with spousal providers;
- Cases with parents providing services to their own minor children;
- Cases with recipients receiving advance pay;
- Cases with recipients who are covered by third party insurance; and,
- Cases with recipients receiving a restaurant meal allowance (RMA). The RMA is provided to those who need to purchase meals or help with meal preparation and cleanup.

In-Home Supportive Services are provided in any of three service delivery modes. Those service modes are the individual provider (IP) mode, the county contract (CC) mode, and the welfare staff (WS) mode. The WS mode is also referred to as the county homemaker mode. The IP mode consists of an individual, hired by the recipient, who provides services to the recipient. The CC mode provides for IHSS services to be performed by a service provider under contract with the individual counties. The contractor employs the individuals who provide the services to the recipient. The WS mode utilizes county employees to provide services for recipients.

---

## Personal Care Services Program/Residual IHSS Basic Costs

### DESCRIPTION (continued):

The State Compensation Insurance Fund (SCIF), under contract, administers the workers' compensation insurance for the IPs providing services for IHSS recipients.

The Department of General Services (DGS), under contract, acts as agent for the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) in the management and supervision of SCIF. DGS also monitors high cost cases (\$50,000 and over in paid costs) on a quarterly basis.

The IHSS Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) authorizes payments and provides CDSS and the counties with information regarding wages, taxes, hours per case, cost per hour, PCSP and Residual Program caseload and funding ratios, share of cost, RMA, and the number of providers in the IP mode. Please see the CMIPS premise for more information.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The PCSP implemented on April 1, 1993.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 12300-12314 and 14132.95.
- The projected caseload percentages for the PCSP and Residual Program are 92.82 percent and 7.18 percent, respectively, based on the average caseloads for July 2005 through January 2006.
- The CC mode was assumed to be the average caseload for July 2004 through June 2005. The WS mode was assumed to be the average caseload for July 2005 through January 2006. PCSP caseloads were 3,370 (CC) and 121 (WS), and Residual caseloads were 623 (CC) and 14 (WS). The balance of the caseload is IP.
- The PCSP CC mode average monthly hours per case is assumed to be 52.6 hours at a cost per hour of \$17.39. The WS average monthly hours per case is assumed to be 9.75 hours at a cost per hour of \$15.19.
- The Residual CC mode average monthly hours per case is assumed to be 24.1 hours at a cost per hour of \$16.85. The Residual WS average monthly hours per case is assumed to be 6.95 hours at a cost per hour of \$13.47.
- The IP wage rate and average monthly hours per case are based on the individual counties data.
- The payroll tax rate associated with the IP wages is assumed at ten percent.
- Based on actuals for July 2005 through January 2006, the average recipient PCSP Program share of cost (SOC) is assumed to be \$349 per case in the current and budget year in the IP mode of service. The average recipient Residual program share of cost is assumed to be \$285 and \$301 per case in the IP mode and CC/WS modes of service, respectively.

---

## Personal Care Services Program/Residual IHSS Basic Costs

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- In the PCSP program, the average monthly SOC caseload is assumed to be 6,551 in the current year and 7,001 in the budget year.
- In the Residual Program, the average monthly SOC caseload is assumed to be 1,080 in the current year and 1,154 in the budget year in the IP Mode, and 48 in the CC/WS for both current and budget years.
- The RMA cost per case is \$62.
- The RMA cost is estimated to be \$572,496 for current year and \$611,852 in the budget year.
- The SCIF contract cost is assumed to be \$57 million for both the current and budget year.
- The DGS contract cost is set at \$120,000 for both the current and budget year.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The estimated PCSP basic cost is computed by multiplying the casemonths times the average hours per case times the cost per hour, plus the associated payroll taxes, minus the share of cost. In addition, the PCSP caseload percentage of the SCIF and DGS contract costs are added.
- The estimated Residual basic cost is computed by multiplying the casemonths times the average hours per case times the cost per hour, plus associated payroll taxes, minus the share of cost. In addition, the Residual Program caseload percentage of the SCIF, DGS contract costs and RMA are added.

### FUNDING:

- In the PCSP, the Title XIX Federal Medical Assistance Percentage rate is 50 percent.
- The nonfederal share is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county. The county share of cost is reflected as a reimbursement, consistent with actual cash flow.
- The administration received a waiver for the federal government to pick up a share of cost for the Residual program. (See Waiver Program/Medical State Plan Amendment for Residual)
- In the Residual Program Basic Costs, the state share is 65 percent of the total, and the county share is 35 percent. The county share of cost is reflected as a reimbursement, consistent with actual cash flow.

## Personal Care Services Program/Residual IHSS Basic Costs

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The estimate has been updated using current caseload and expenditure data. The distribution between PCSP and residual program is updated to reflect caseload.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year increase reflects wage and benefits increases and caseload growth.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly PCSP Caseload	328,666	351,260
Average Monthly Residual Program Caseload	25,406	27,153

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

TOTAL	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$3,629,956	\$3,963,966
Federal	0	0
State	1,256,532	1,368,828
County	0	0
Reimbursements	2,373,424	2,595,138

## Personal Care Services Program/Residual IHSS Basic Costs

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

PCSP	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$3,348,020	\$3,658,324
Federal	0	0
State	1,074,764	1,172,123
County	0	0
Reimbursements	2,273,256	2,486,201

  

Residual Program	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$281,936	\$305,642
Federal	0	0
State	181,768	196,705
County	0	0
Reimbursements	100,168	108,937



***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

---

## **Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) and Associated Costs**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs associated with the operation and maintenance of the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS). The CMIPS consists of the following three components:

#### **Case Management**

The CMIPS stores the case record of each individual recipient. The case record of each recipient contains information on eligibility, needs assessment, share of cost, if appropriate, and all changes affecting the recipient's case. The CMIPS also generates notices of action, cost-of-living adjustments, and rate changes. The CMIPS further allows for data exchanges with other welfare systems and is used to establish Medi-Cal eligibility. Unique Client Index Numbers (CINs) facilitate the identification of common clients and the exchange of data with other systems. In current year ongoing CIN transactions are processed through the Health and Human Services Data Center server. In budget year CIN transactions will be processed through the Office of Systems Integration server.

#### **Management Information**

The CMIPS provides periodic management reports that include fiscal and statistical data on a case-by-case, worker-by-worker, office-by-office, county-by-county, and statewide basis.

#### **Payrolling System**

The CMIPS provides for the authorization and issuance of warrants for payments for services provided by the individual-provider mode and prepares all employer tax forms and reports. These reports are utilized for bookkeeping, accounting and tax preparation purposes on behalf of recipients, County Welfare Departments and the California Department of Social Services (CDSS).

The State Controller's Office (SCO), under contract with CDSS, issues payroll checks to the individual providers on behalf of IHSS recipients. The SCO also issues replacement checks and handles checks returned as undeliverable.

The State Treasurer's Office (STO), under contract with CDSS, performs bank reconciliation of IHSS warrants, and redeems all valid warrants issued for IHSS providers.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section section 12302.2.
- The CMIPS contract is currently held by Electronic Data Systems (EDS).
- The estimated costs for the SCO and STO contracts were updated.

## Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) and Associated Costs

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- The estimated CIN transaction costs are based on a projection of the number of transactions and a cost of 0.7 cents per transaction.

	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>
<b>EDS</b>	\$8,996,557	\$9,607,452
<b>STO</b>	\$856,063	\$856,063
<b>SCO</b>	\$4,306,000	\$4,534,392
<b>CIN Transaction</b>	\$8,307	\$8,307
<b>Total Costs</b>	\$14,166,927	\$15,006,214

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is computed by summing the EDS, STO, SCO and CIN data and transaction fee costs. The total cost is split between the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP) and the Residual Program based on percent to total caseload.

### FUNDING:

- In the PCSP Program, the federal Title XIX reimbursement represents 50 percent of the total funding in the current and budget year. The nonfederal share is split 70 percent state and 30 percent county.
- In the Residual Program, the state share is 70 percent of the total, and the county share is 30 percent.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The Fiscal Year 2005-06 estimate includes increased EDS costs. The distribution between PCSP and residual program is updated to reflect caseload.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in FY 2006-07 is due to increased EDS costs.

## Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) and Associated Costs

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

<b>TOTAL</b>	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$14,167	\$15,006
Federal	0	0
State	5,315	5,630
County	2,277	2,412
Reimbursements	6,575	6,964
 <b>PCSP</b>	 2005-06	 2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$13,149	\$13,928
Federal	0	0
State	4,602	4,875
County	1,972	2,089
Reimbursements	6,575	6,964
 <b>Residual Program</b>	 2005-06	 2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$1,018	\$1,078
Federal	0	0
State	713	755
County	305	323
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

# **Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) Enhancements to Support a Federal Waiver and Quality Assurance**

## **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the funding required for several CMIPS enhancements needed to meet the documentation and data collection and reporting requirements of the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Quality Assurance (QA) Initiative and the California Independence Plus waiver program. The enhancements include a new interface with the California Medicaid Management Information System to identify fraudulent activities, as well as provision of statewide registry and enrollment data for eligible IHSS Plus waiver recipients.

## **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 12317 [Chapter 229, Statutes of 2004 (Senate Bill 1104)].
- Electronic Data Systems programming cost per hour is \$86.50.
- CMIPS enhancements for the QA Initiative require 10,400 hours of programming.
- CMIPS enhancements for the California Independence Plus waiver program require 4,050 hours of programming.
- CMIPS enhancements for the Medi-Cal Provider Point of Sale capability require 4,624 hours of programming.

## **METHODOLOGY:**

The estimate is computed by summing the programming costs for the IHSS QA Initiative and the California Independence Plus waiver program.

## **FUNDING:**

- In the Personal Care Service Program (PCSP), the federal Title XIX reimbursement represents 50 percent of the total funding in the current and budget year. The nonfederal share is split 35 percent state and 15 percent county.
- In the Residual Program, the state share is 70 percent of the total, and the county share is 30 percent. The shift of 50 percent of the funding to federal Title XIX is shown in the Waiver for Residual Program premise.

## **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

This premise is amended to carry over funds from current year to budget year. Also, the distribution between PCSP and residual program is updated to reflect caseload.

## Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) Enhancements to Support a Federal Waiver and Quality Assurance

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

In order to complete the Medi-Cal Provider Point of Sale capability by June 2006, other enhancements will not be completed in current year. Consequently, shifting some costs to budget year.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

<b>TOTAL</b>	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$487	\$914
Federal	0	0
State	313	447
County	134	192
Reimbursements	40	275
 <b>PCSP</b>	 2005-06	 2006-07
Total	\$81	\$551
Federal	0	0
State	29	193
County	12	83
Reimbursements	40	275
 <b>Residual Program</b>	 2005-06	 2006-07
Total	\$406	\$363
Federal	0	0
State	284	254
County	122	109
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Case Management, Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) II Contract Procurement**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs for contracting with the Office of Systems Integration (OSI) for development, support, and implementation of a new and enhanced In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Case Management, Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS). This project proposes to replace the existing CMIPS with new technologies that provide system access for all IHSS county workers and a communication network between state and county IHSS offices.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on April 1, 2000.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 12302.2.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The estimated costs are detailed in the December 2005 Planning Advance Planning Document Update.

### **FUNDING:**

- In the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP), the Title XIX Federal Medical Assistance Percentage rate is 50 percent.
- The nonfederal share is funded 100 percent State General Fund (GF).
- In the Residual Program, the funding is 100 percent GF.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The current year and budget year decrease reflects a technical adjustment.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The budget year reflects an increase in projected costs for OSI to extend the planning phase through January 2007 and begin the implementation phase in February 2007. Thirteen additional consultant positions, and 4 additional state staff, will be added February 1, 2007 to assist with the implementation ramp-up activities.



## Case Management, Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) II Contract Procurement

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Total	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$3,378	\$25,589
Federal	0	0
State	1,813	13,722
County	0	0
Reimbursements	1,565	11,867

PCSP	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$3,132	\$23,736
Federal	0	0
State	1,567	11,869
County	0	0
Reimbursements	1,565	11,867

Residual Program	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$246	\$1,853
Federal	0	0
State	246	1,853
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$3,378	\$25,589
CDSS	230	222
OSI	3,148	25,367

## Public Authority Administration

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the Public Authority (PA) administrative costs. Senate Bill 1780 (Chapter 206, Statutes of 1996) defined the make-up and functions of PAs. A county board of supervisors may elect to establish a PA to provide for the delivery of In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS). PAs are separate entities from the county in which they operate. Employees of the PA shall not be employees of the county for any reason. PAs are the employer of IHSS providers for the purposes of collective bargaining over wages, hours, and other terms of employment. However, IHSS recipients retain the right to hire, fire, and supervise the work of any IHSS worker providing services to them.

A PA shall provide, but is not limited to, the following functions:

- The provision of assistance to recipients in finding IHSS providers through the establishment of a registry;
- The investigation of the qualifications and background of potential providers;
- The establishment of a referral system under which IHSS providers shall be referred to recipients;
- The provision of training for providers and recipients; and,
- Other functions related to the delivery of IHSS.

The PA rate includes the hourly costs for wages, employer taxes, benefits, and administrative costs. The PA rate cannot exceed 200 percent of the current minimum wage in order to qualify for federal financial participation. The PA must submit a rate approval request to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). Once CDSS approves the request, it is submitted to the California Department of Health Services (CDHS) for final approval. After CDHS approves the rate, the PA can claim its costs.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 12301.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimated cost is computed by multiplying the casemonths by the average hours per case by the administrative hourly rates for each PA.

## Public Authority Administration

### FUNDING:

- In the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP), the Title XIX Federal Medical Assistance Percentage rate is 50 percent.
- The nonfederal share is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county.
- In the Residual Program, the State share is 65 percent of the total, and the county share is 35 percent.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current estimate has been updated to incorporate the most current PA administrative rate and caseload information and the addition of Lassen County as a public authority effective September 2005. The increase in PCSP reflects a greater percentage of cases in PCSP.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year increase reflects the addition of Lassen County and Mariposa County as public authorities, mid-Fiscal Year 2005-06 administrative rate changes and caseload growth.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

TOTAL		2005-06	2006-07
		Admin	Admin
Total		\$47,566	\$51,593
Federal		0	0
State		16,938	18,339
County		0	0
Reimbursements		30,628	33,254
PCSP		2005-06	2006-07
		Admin	Admin
Total		\$43,015	\$46,759
Federal		0	0
State		13,980	15,197
County		0	0
Reimbursements		29,035	31,562

## Public Authority Administration

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

Residual Program	2005-06	2006-07
	Admin	Admin
Total	\$4,551	\$4,834
Federal	0	0
State	2,958	3,142
County	0	0
Reimbursements	1,593	1,692

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## PCSP Three-Month Retroactive Benefits

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs in the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP), associated with implementing a Medi-Cal rule that provides reimbursement for eligible In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Personal Care services rendered up to three months prior to application.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2005.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Budget Act of 2004.
- Based on the number of approvals in July 1994 through June 2005, 1.67 percent of cases each month will be new applicants.
- Based on recent Medi-Cal data, it was assumed that 0.02 percent of all applicants would be eligible for at least one month of retroactive benefits for the period prior to the month of application. It was also assumed that on average the applicants would receive 1.16 months of retroactive benefits.
- In addition, it was assumed that 2.58 percent of applicants would be eligible to receive a retroactive benefit for a portion of the month in which they applied. The average period of retroactive benefit was assumed to be two weeks.
- The administrative cost of processing the retroactive payments is assumed to require 1 additional hour to review incoming claims to determine eligibility and 1.5 additional hours to process eligible claims. It is assumed that 10 percent of all applicants will submit a claim. The social worker cost per hour is assumed to be \$60.55.
- This premise no longer applies to cases prior to budget year. Current year costs are subject to the requirements of the pending *Conlan v Shewry* lawsuit.

### METHODOLOGY:

The number of cases to receive retroactive benefits was derived using the percentage of new cases and the percentage of cases that are eligible to receive retroactive benefits.

Estimated costs for benefits were based on the number of eligible retroactive cases, the average monthly cost per case and the assumption that each case would receive either two weeks or 1.16 months of retroactive benefits.

The administrative costs were based on the number of claims received and eligible retroactive claims, the time to review or process each case and IHSS social worker cost per hour.

## PCSP Three-Month Retroactive Benefits

### FUNDING:

- In the PCSP, the Title XIX Federal Medical Assistance Percentage rate is 50 percent.
- The nonfederal share is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county. The county share of costs is reflected as a reimbursement, consistent with actual cash flow.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The estimate has been updated to reflect the percent of new case approvals and current caseload information.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in budget year reflects a change in methodology.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Total PCSP/Residual	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$861
Federal	0	0
State	0	332
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	529

PCSP	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$701
Federal	0	0
State	0	228
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	473

## PCSP Three-Month Retroactive Benefits

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

Residual Program	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$0	\$160
Federal	0	0
State	0	104
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	56
Administration	2005-06	2006-07
	Admin.	Admin.
Total	\$0	\$667
Federal	0	0
State	0	238
County	0	102
Reimbursements	0	327



***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## IHSS Quality Assurance

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings from the implementation of a Quality Assurance (QA) program that will reduce the costs of the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Program by improving the quality of service need assessments and authorizations. The California Department of Social Services proposes to (1) require and support QA functions in each county, (2) increase state resources for monitoring and supporting county QA functions, (3) provide standardized assessment training for county IHSS workers, and (4) provide periodic written notices to providers that remind them of their legal obligations to submit accurate timesheets.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on December 1, 2004.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- County QA staff and additional IHSS workers were hired in Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05 and (FY) 2005-06.
- Pilot training for county workers began in July 2005.
- Beginning FY 2005-06, approximately 2,500 county workers will receive training annually.
- The average hours for new cases or cases reassessed after the county workers have completed the training will be reduced by ten percent due to improved and uniform assessment processes and the use of uniform assessment guidelines.
- Hiring additional IHSS workers will reduce workers caseloads. The reduced workloads will result in a one percent reduction of costs statewide from improved assessments, better documentation and explanation of case decisions.
- There will also be a one percent reduction in costs as a result of actions taken by county QA workers and a one percent reduction in costs due to new fraud activities.
- Twelve percent of cases will have conditions which will be expected to improve and will be flagged for reassessments prior to the annual review. There will be an average of three percent reduction in hours for those cases that are reassessed.

### METHODOLOGY:

#### COSTS

##### County Staff

- It is assumed there are 110 County QA Staff and 110 IHSS workers.
- The annual Social Worker (SW) cost is assumed to be \$129,083.
- The estimated current and budget year county assurance staff costs are \$28.4 million [\$10.2 million General Fund (GF)].

## IHSS Quality Assurance

### **METHODOLOGY (continued):**

#### State level training for SWs

- Both the initial training and the refresher course will require four days.
- 2,500 county workers will attend training in FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07.
- Hourly costs are assumed to be \$54.08 per hour.
- Total estimated costs for FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 will be \$4.2 million (\$1.5 million GF).

### **SAVINGS**

#### Reduced hours due to uniform needs assessments

- It is assumed that the average hours for new cases and cases reassessed after the county workers have completed training will be reduced by ten percent due to statewide uniformity in needs assessments and service authorizations and the use of uniform assessment guidelines.
- Savings will be phased in as county workers who have completed the training assess new cases or complete reassessments.
- Savings for FY 2005-06 are estimated to be \$152.5 million (\$49.6 million GF), and \$301.3 million (\$97.9 million GF) for FY 2006-07.

#### Other savings

- Savings which will result from the hiring of additional staff, earlier reassessments and fraud activities began in March 2005.

The percentage of anticipated savings was applied to the sum of the estimated Basic Costs to determine the amount of savings.

Savings for each of the one percent reductions for the additional QA staff, the additional IHSS workers, and the fraud activates will be \$36.3 million (\$11.8 million GF) in FY 2005-06 and \$39.6 million (\$12.9 million GF) in FY 2006-07.

Savings for the earlier reassessments of recipients whose conditions are expected to improve will be \$13.1 million (\$4.3 million GF) in FY 2005-06 and \$14.3 million (\$4.6 million in GF) in FY 2006-07.

### **FUNDING:**

- The Title XIX reimbursement rate is 50 percent.
- The nonfederal share is split 65 percent State and 35 percent county. The county share of costs is reflected as a reimbursement, consistent with actual cash flow.
- In administration, the State and county sharing ratios are 70 percent and 30 percent, respectively, of the nonfederal share.

## IHSS Quality Assurance

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The estimate is updated to reflect current wage and caseload information. Also, the distribution between the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP) and residual reflects the increase in the percentage of cases in PCSP.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increased savings from CY to BY are due to caseload growth and increased cost per case. The Administration costs reflect the increase in PCSP cases.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

<b>TOTAL PCSP/RESIDUAL</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>
Total	-\$274,516	-\$434,519
Federal	0	0
State	-89,218	-141,219
County	0	0
Reimbursements	-185,298	-293,300
<b>PCSP</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>
Total	-\$251,129	-\$398,068
Federal	0	0
State	-81,617	-129,372
County	0	0
Reimbursements	-169,512	-268,696
<b>Residual</b>	<b>2005-06</b>	<b>2006-07</b>
Total	-\$23,387	-\$36,451
Federal	0	0
State	-7,601	-11,847
County	0	0
Reimbursements	-15,786	-24,604

## IHSS Quality Assurance

### EXPENDITURES (CONTINUED):

(in 000's)

Administration	2005-06	2065-07
Total	\$32,602	\$32,602
Federal	0	0
State	11,691	11,625
County	5,011	4,982
Reimbursements	15,900	15,995

## **Income Eligible Shift (Share of Cost Buy-out)**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

AB 2779 (Chapter 329, Statutes of 1998), allowed the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) to buy down In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) recipients' share of cost (SOC) from the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) SOC level to the Medi-Cal SOC level. This premise reflects the costs to the State General Fund for the buy-out and spenddown of an IHSS recipient's Medi-Cal Recognized Expenses (MRE). The buy-out and spenddown apply to recipients who receive services under the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP) or the IHSS Plus Waiver (IPW) program for whom a Medi-Cal eligibility determination has been completed. The buy-out is the difference between a recipient's SSI/SSP SOC and Medi-Cal SOC. The spenddown is the cost of a recipient's MREs equal to a recipient's IHSS SOC and will only be paid until the Case Management Information and Payrolling System (CMIPS) enhancements have been completed and the recipient's Medi-Cal point of sale expenditures can be tracked. CDSS is paying recipients' SSI/SSP SOC (spenddown) to ensure recipients will remain Medi-Cal eligible until the CMIPS enhancements have been completed.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

The buy-out implemented on April 1, 1999. The spenddown implemented on November 1, 2005, via All County Letter No. 05-35 (October 28, 2005).

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 12305.1 and 14132.95.
- CDSS will pay the spenddown from November 2005 to May 2006.
- The buy-out applies when a recipient's Medi-Cal SOC is greater than the recipient's SSI/SSP SOC. When a recipient's Medical Family Budget Unit (MFBU) is composed of more than just the recipient, the comparison applies to the entire MFBU SOC under Medi-Cal.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 estimate is based on actual annual costs for the buyout and costs for seven months for the spenddown. The FY 2006-07 estimate is based on actual annual costs for the buyout only.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The increase reflects actual buy-out and spenddown costs for PCSP and IPW recipients whose Medi-Cal eligibility determination has resulted in a higher Medi-Cal SOC.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The spenddown expenditures are expected to end in May 2006. Buyout expenditures will, however, continue.

## Income Eligible Shift (Share of Cost Buy-out)

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

<b>PCSP</b>	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$38,831	\$41,162
Federal	0	0
State	38,831	41,162
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Waiver Personal Care Services

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise, formerly called Extended Personal Care Services (Assembly Bill (AB) 668), reflects the costs for Personal Care Services that are provided above a recipient's assessed limit in the In-Home Supportive Services/Personal Care Services Program (IHSS/PCSP).

AB 668 (Chapter 896, Statutes of 1998) provided for additional hours on behalf of eligible PCSP recipients if they needed more than the 283 monthly hours allowed under IHSS and qualified for the Medi-Cal Skilled Nursing Facility Level of Care (SNFLOC) home and community based services waiver program. The SNFLOC waiver program was approved by the Health Care Financing Administration effective July 1, 1999.

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) has since renewed the nursing facility waiver, which now includes A and B levels of care (NF A/B). Approval has also been received for a new waiver for adult and pediatric subacute (NF Subacute) levels of care. "Waiver Personal Care Services" has been redefined in these two waivers to include services that differ from those in the State Plan and which allow beneficiaries to remain at home. Although there will no longer be a requirement that waiver consumers receive the maximum of 283 hours of State Plan Personal Care Services (SPPCS) prior to receiving waiver personal care services, waiver consumers must be receiving some SPPCS. Waiver personal care services will be one option on a menu of services that waiver participants may choose from, to the extent that waiver cost neutrality is assured. These services will be provided through the counties' IHSS programs and will be paid via an interagency agreement with the California Department of Social Services, or will be provided by home health agencies.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 14132.97.
- The NF A/B average monthly caseload is assumed to be 372 in the Current Year (CY) and 450 in the Budget Year (BY). The NF Subacute average monthly caseload is assumed to be 171 in the CY and 219 in the BY.
- The NF A/B average monthly hours of service per case are 171 in the CY and 168 in the BY. The NF Subacute average monthly hours of service per case are 306 in the CY and 301 in the BY.
- The cost per hour is assumed at \$9.34.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimated cost is computed by multiplying the caseload by the average hours per case by the cost per hour by twelve months.



## Waiver Personal Care Services

### FUNDING:

The Title XIX Federal Medical Assistance Percentage rate is 50 percent. The nonfederal share of the service costs is reimbursed 100 percent by the Department of Health Services.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The estimate was updated to include the most recent actuals.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY increase reflects caseload growth.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

PCSP	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$12,973	\$15,811
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	12,973	15,811

## **Tyler v. Anderson Settlement and Implementation**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects court settlement and implementation costs associated with the *Tyler v. Anderson* lawsuit. The *Tyler v. Anderson* lawsuit was the result of misinterpreting the range-of-motion services coverage under the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Program. As a result, some counties authorized range-of-motion services, while other counties did not. Range of motion became a covered service with the implementation of the Personal Care Services Program (PCSP) in 1993. The plaintiffs who were denied those services sued for retroactive payment. The lawsuit was settled on January 22, 1999.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 1999.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- The retroactive payments are for Fiscal Years (FYs) 1990-91, 1991-92, and 1992-93.
- The range-of-motion services were classified as either rubbing-of-skin services or paramedical services.
- The minimum wage in effect during the period covered by *Tyler v. Anderson* was \$4.25 per hour.
- This estimate uses a tax-to-wages ratio of 9.79 percent.
- The current year (CY) estimate includes costs associated with the mailing of 400 notices regarding Part E of the application.
- The administrative costs associated with this premise are included in the "IHSS Court Cases" premise.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Anticipated payments resulting from claims total \$341,000. These costs reflect payments for new Part E claims.

### **FUNDING:**

The CY costs associated with this premise are paid with State General Fund.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

It is expected that all new Part E claims will not be paid in FY 2005-06.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The FY 2006-07 estimate reflects the payment of claims in the budget year.

## **Tyler v. Anderson Settlement and Implementation**

### **EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$50	\$291
Federal	0	0
State	50	291
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Waiver Program/Medi-Cal State Plan Amendment for Residual

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the savings associated with implementation of a federal Medicaid (Medi-Cal) Waiver and Personal Care Services Program (PCSP) state plan amendment that allows In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Residual Program consumer services to qualify for federal Title XIX funds. The IHSS Program enables eligible individuals to remain safely in their own homes as an alternative to out-of-home care. Eligible IHSS recipients are aged, blind or disabled individuals who receive public assistance or have low incomes and can be cared for by a relative or nonrelative. In July 2004, the State received a five-year Independence Plus, Section 1115 Demonstration Waiver from the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). This waiver will permit the State to provide in-home consumer directed services with federal funds to individuals historically served in the non-federal IHSS Residual Program. The individuals to be covered under the waiver include 1) recipients whose services are provided by a spouse or parent (if the recipient is a minor child), 2) recipients receiving advance cash payments, and 3) recipients with restaurant meal allowances. Residual cases not covered under the waiver, such as cases with protective supervision services where the providers are not parents or spouses, and domestic and related services only cases, will be covered under a Medi-Cal funded PCSP. After the State Plan is amended and approved, the State can claim federal Title XIX funds for these eligible cases. As a condition of the waiver, CMS is requiring case files include client information regarding emergency contacts and emergency back-up plans if the IHSS provider is not available. This information will be obtained at the time of assessment and reassessment on a form to be developed by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS).

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The IHSS Plus Waiver (IPW) became effective on August 1, 2004.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Most Residual Program cases will become eligible for federal Title XIX funds under the IPW program or the Medi-Cal State Plan amendments.
- The administrative cost is assumed to require 5 additional minutes annually per recipient for the social worker to complete the new form. Social worker cost per hour is assumed to be \$60.55.

### METHODOLOGY:

The savings are determined by computing a federal Medi-Cal share of cost for projected Residual Program expenditures with amended corresponding State and county shares.

Prior to calculating the savings, the estimate for the Basic costs was reduced by \$46.6 million [\$30.3 million State General Fund (GF)] for current year and \$47.2 million (\$30.7 million GF) for the budget year to adjust for an estimate of the number of cases that will be ineligible for services under the waiver.

The administrative costs were based on the number of recipients in budget year, the additional time per case for the new form and the social worker cost per hour.

## Waiver Program/Medi-Cal State Plan Amendment for Residual

### FUNDING:

- The Title XIX federal sharing ratio is based on the July 1, 2004 Federal Medical Assistance Percentage rate of 50 percent.
- The nonfederal share is split 65 percent state and 35 percent county. The county share of cost is reflected as a reimbursement, consistent with actual cash flow.
- The Title XIX funds are shown as a reimbursement from the California Department of Health Services.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year and budget year estimates are updated to allow for cases that have not yet been determined eligible for PCSP or the IPW program. The budget year includes administrative costs.

The CMS is requiring counties to collect additional client information regarding emergency contacts and back-up providers. This information will be collected on a form, to be developed by the CDSS, to be completed at the time of assessments and annual reassessments.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The waiver costs reflect the total changes to the residual program.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Residual Program	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	-78,520	-86,757
County	-214	-216
Reimbursements	78,734	86,973

## Waiver Program/Medical State Plan Amendment for Residual

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000's)

Administration	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$0	\$1,910
Federal	0	0
State	0	681
County	0	292
Reimbursements	0	937

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## **Title XIX Reimbursement – In-Home Supportive Services/CSBG/Child Welfare Services**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the level of reimbursement associated with Title XIX eligible services. Federal financial participation (FFP) is authorized under Title XIX of the federal Social Security Act (42 U.S.C., Section 1396, et. seq.). Certain In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS), assessment and eligibility activities, county services block grant (CSBG) activities, and adult protective services (APS), are eligible for Title XIX federal funding. Additionally, certain health-related (HR) activities in the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Program are also eligible for these funds.

The California Department of Social Services has coordinated with the Department of Health Services to establish the necessary claiming processes to identify the applicable FFP.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

#### **IHSS**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions (W&I) Code Sections 12300 through 12317.2.
- The IHSS Personal Care Services Program (PCSP) is eligible for Title XIX funding at the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP).
- The IHSS Program costs are eligible for the Title XIX funding at the enhanced administrative rate of 75 percent for the Skilled Professional Medical Personnel (SPMP) and the non-enhanced administrative rate of 50 percent for health-related costs.
- The Independence Plus Waiver for the Residual Program became effective August 1, 2004, and state plan amendments to the PCSP will permit claiming of the Residual Program expenditures retroactively to the date the waiver was submitted.

#### **CWS**

- Authorizing statute: W&I Code Section 16500.
- The CWS Program costs are eligible for the Title XIX funding at the enhanced administrative rate of 75 percent for the SPMP and the non-enhanced administrative rate of 50 percent for health-related costs.

#### **CSBG/APS**

Authorizing statute: W&I Code Sections 13004 through 13007 (CSBG) and Sections 15703 through 15705.40 (APS).

### **METHODOLOGY:**

#### **IHSS PCSP/Residual Waiver**

The Title XIX federal sharing ratio is based on the FMAP rate of 50 percent.



## **Title XIX Reimbursement – In-Home Supportive Services/CSBG/Child Welfare Services**

### **METHODOLOGY (continued):**

#### **IHSS Administration**

- HR activities performed in support of Medi-Cal eligible recipients are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 50 percent. These same activities, if performed by SPMP (those staff who have a health care license or certificate) are eligible for Title XIX Reimbursement at an enhanced rate of 75 percent.
- The federal share of actual expenditures for the past two quarters was used in the current year and budget year estimates.

#### **CWS**

For FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07, the Title XIX reimbursement was calculated using prior year actual expenditures.

#### **CSBG/APS**

- HR activities in support of Medi-Cal eligible recipients are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 50 percent. Activities performed by SPMP are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at an enhanced rate of 75 percent.
- Costs are based on actual expenditures.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The estimate has been updated to reflect current data.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The change reflects actual program costs.

### **EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
<b><u>Title XIX Total</u></b>	<b>\$1,936,933</b>	<b>\$2,047,180</b>
<b><u>IHSS Services</u></b>	<b>\$1,693,875</b>	<b>\$1,796,304</b>
PCSP	1,584,768	1,681,056
Waiver/State Plan Amendment	109,107	115,248
<b>Total Health Related</b>	<b>\$243,058</b>	<b>\$250,876</b>
IHSS Administration	148,957	152,043
CWS	48,729	53,461
CSBG	10,908	10,908
APS	34,464	34,464

## **In-Home Supportive Services Administration – Basic Costs**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs of administering the In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Program. Assembly Bill 1773 (Chapter 939, Statutes of 1992) required the California Department of Health Services to submit a Medicaid state plan amendment to the federal Health Care Financing Administration to include a portion of the IHSS Program as a covered service. The IHSS Program provides in-home services to the aged, blind and disabled to help individuals maintain an independent living arrangement and avoid institutionalization.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

The Title XIX eligible Personal Care Services Program was implemented in April of 1993.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 12300 through 12314 and 14132.95.
- The social worker (SW) unit cost is held at \$60.55 per hour in the current and budget years.
- The standard hours per case are 11.5 hours.
- The Supported Individual Provider (SIP) expenditures are assumed to increase with caseload growth. The estimated caseload growth is 5.6 percent in the budget year.
- The estimated Title XIX reimbursement percentage is 49.06 percent, based on actual expenditure information as reported on the County Expense Claim for the past four quarters.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The estimated cost is computed by multiplying the caseload times the standard hours per case times the SW unit cost, plus the estimated SIP costs.

### **FUNDING:**

- The State and county sharing ratios are 70 percent and 30 percent, respectively, of the nonfederal share.
- The Title XIX reimbursements are as follows:
  - (a) Costs incurred from activities to help Medi-Cal eligible adults are eligible for Title XIX reimbursements at either 75 percent or 50 percent, depending on the type of service provider; and,
  - (b) Costs incurred from non-health related activities are not eligible for Title XIX reimbursements.

## In-Home Supportive Services Administration – Basic Costs

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year reflects adjustments to the projected caseload.

### CASELOAD:

	2005-06	2006-07
Average Monthly Caseload	354,072	378,413

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$268,926	\$271,441
Federal	0	0
State	96,444	96,788
County	41,333	41,480
Reimbursements	131,149	133,173

---

## County Employer of Record (AB 2235)

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of administrative activities necessary for counties to act as the employer of record for In-Home Supportive Service (IHSS) providers. Counties may choose to act as the employer of record for IHSS individual providers to achieve compliance with Assembly Bill (AB) 1682.

AB 2235 (Chapter 1135, Statutes of 2002) further requires any county, not in compliance with the mandates of AB 1682 within a specified timeframe, to act as the employer of record for collective bargaining purposes. To comply, counties had to provide documentation, no later than January 15, 2003, in support of compliance, or detailed information in support of delayed compliance by March 31, 2003. Counties that did not provide required documentation, or meet the delayed compliance deadline, automatically defaulted to act as the employer of record.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2003.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 12300 through 12314 and 14132.95.
- This estimate assumes that Alpine and Tuolumne counties will act as employer of record for both the Current Year (CY) and the Budget Year (BY). Lassen County acted as employer of record through August 2005, and became a public authority September 1, 2005. Mariposa County acted as employer of record through April 2006 and became a public authority May 1, 2006.
- The estimated Title XIX reimbursement percentage is 49.06 percent based on actual expenditure information as reported on the county administrative expense claim for the past four quarters.

### METHODOLOGY:

The CY and BY estimated cost is the sum of the projected annual costs for each county.

### FUNDING:

The State and county sharing ratios are 70 percent and 30 percent, respectively, of the nonfederal share.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

Mariposa County is now a public authority.

## County Employer of Record (AB 2235)

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Lassen and Mariposa Counties are now public authorities.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$954	\$340
Federal	0	0
State	343	121
County	147	52
Reimbursements	464	167

## In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) Program Court Cases

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost of court settlements and attorney fees relating to the IHSS Program. The costs result from settlement of lawsuits pertaining to local assistance in accordance with Budget Letter 98-22 and instructions from the Department of Finance.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The estimate for settlement costs and attorney fees relating to court cases is based in part on actual payments for cases in the current year (CY), and the Legal Division's projection of costs that will be paid in both CY and budget year (BY).

### METHODOLOGY:

The CY and BY estimates of costs reflect known and anticipated settlements and attorney fees relating to the IHSS Program and \$60,000 for other court cases. These are state-only costs.

### FUNDING:

IHSS costs for case settlement and attorney fees are funded with 100 percent State General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

This premise is updated for expenditure information.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Court case expenditures may fluctuate from year to year.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$163	\$870
Federal	0	0
State	163	870
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

---

## **In-Home Supportive Services - Advisory Committees**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs of establishing and operating In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) advisory committees as required by Assembly Bill (AB) 1682 (Chapter 90, Statutes of 1999). AB 1682 mandated that counties act as or establish an employer-of-record for IHSS providers on or before January 1, 2003, and establish advisory committees for IHSS purposes. The advisory committees are to submit recommendations to the Board of Supervisors on the preferred mode of IHSS service to be utilized in the county.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented July 1, 2000.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 12300 through 12314.
- The estimate assumes the average annual cost for advisory committees is \$52,974 per county.
- The estimate assumes that all counties have established and will operate advisory committees in the current and budget years.
- The estimated Title XIX reimbursement percentage is 47 percent in the current and budget year, based on actual expenditure information as reported on the county administrative expense claims for Fiscal Year 2004-05.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The estimated cost is computed by multiplying the average annual cost per county times 58 counties.

### **FUNDING:**

The federal Title XIX reimbursement represents 47 percent of the total funding in the current and budget years. The remaining nonfederal share is funded with 100-percent State General Fund.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

There is no change.



---

## In-Home Supportive Services - Advisory Committees

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$3,072	\$3,072
Federal	0	0
State	1,628	1,628
County	0	0
Reimbursements	1,444	1,444

---

## Foster Care & NAFS Administrative Costs – Basic

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the administrative costs and staff development costs for the Foster Care (FC) and Non-Assistance Food Stamps (NAFS) programs. Historically, the budget for county administration was based on counties administrative budget requests made through a Proposed County Administrative Budget (PCAB) process, modified by a cost containment system consistent with Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 14154. Beginning with Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02 the PCAB process was suspended and the last PCAB process, FY 2000-01, established the base from which future year costs are established. Adjustments for caseload changes and other factors are made during each subvention process.

The FC administrative costs include the county administration for the Adoption Assistance Program (AAP). County eligibility workers are required to perform administrative functions related to AAP. Specifically, verification of linkage to the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program (formerly Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program) is required for all new AAP cases to establish federal or nonfederal eligibility. Linkage is based on the child's situation at the time of removal from the natural home. The child must meet the general eligibility requirements for TANF and qualify as either a federal or state-only foster care case. Recertification is also required on a biennial basis.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise is an annual appropriation.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC sections 14154.
- The FC Estimate in FY 2005-06 is being held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level. Base funding for FC Administrative Costs Basic for FY 2006-07 is \$87 million.
- The FC caseload growth projection for FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-7 are 0.4 percent and 0.4 percent, respectively.
- Staff development for FC, \$868,000 for FY 2006-07, was based on the last four quarters of actual expenditures.
- The AAP cost of \$9.2 million for FY 2006-07 was based on the last four quarters of actual expenditures.
- Contract costs for FC are \$143,000 in FY 2006-07, based on FY 2004-05 actual expenditures.
- The NAFS Administrative Costs base funding in FY 2005-06 is \$442.0 million.
- The NAFS caseload growth projection is 9.4 percent in FY 2005-06 and 8.48 percent in FY 2006-07.
- Additional new cases are expected to establish NAFS eligibility in the current year and the budget year as a result of the Hmong Refugees who will be resettling in California. This results in administrative cost of \$700 in FY 2005-06 and \$2,577 in FY 2006-07.

---

## Foster Care & NAFS Administrative Costs – Basic

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- In addition to the Hmong Refugees premise, the impact of the Transitional Benefits, Vehicle Exclusion/Face-to-Face Interviews (AB 231), and Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Administrative Impact premises for NAFS and California Food Assistance Program are reflected in the NAFS Administrative Basic Costs resulting in net savings of \$22.0 million in FY 2005-06 and \$22.8 million in FY 2006-07.
- The additional cases associated with Hurricane Katrina are reflected in the caseload trend. These administrative costs associated with these cases were reduced from the NAFS Administrative Costs and included in a separate Hurricane Katrina premise (refer to the premise description for more details).
- Statewide Automated Welfare System Development and Testing Interface costs for NAFS are \$168,287 for FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07, based on updated expenditures.
- Contract costs for NAFS are \$3.3 million for FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07, based on FY updated expenditures.
- Staff development costs for NAFS are \$7.3 million for FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 were based on calendar year 2005 actual expenditures.
- The NAFS and FC estimates were adjusted due to a shift of administrative costs (\$97,206 and \$7,776, respectively) related to the MAGIC system that were formerly in a separate premise line and are now included in basic.

### METHODOLOGY:

The NAFS and FC basic funding were adjusted to reflect caseload growth and updated rolled premises. Staff development expenditures, the MAGIC system, and contract costs were added to both the NAFS and FC estimates. AAP administrative expenditures were also added to the FC estimate.

### FUNDING:

FC & NAFS costs are shared 50 percent federal, 35 percent state, and 15 percent county.

**Note:** W&IC section 15204.4 requires maintenance of effort (MOE) from the counties based on expenditures during FY 1996-97, which include the administration of food stamps. Please reference the "County MOE Adjustment" premise.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

For NAFS, the changes are due to 1) projected caseload growth; 2) updated rolled premises.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The changes for Foster Care and NAFS are due to projected caseload growth.

## Foster Care & NAFS Administrative Costs – Basic

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

<b>Foster Care</b>	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$95,862	\$97,369
Federal	48,160	48,905
State	34,958	35,441
County	12,744	13,023
Reimbursements	0	0

### NAFS

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$472,162	\$512,390
Federal	236,913	257,097
State	178,252	193,387
County	56,997	61,906
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Foster Care Reforms

### DESCRIPTION:

The California Department of Social Services implemented the annual redetermination of eligibility for foster care grants, resulting in current year (CY) savings of \$10.6 million and budget year (BY) savings of \$10.6 million.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented July 1, 2004.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The amount of federal financial participation (FFP) is based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage (FMAP) rate of 50 percent.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimate assumes a 20 percent reduction in continuing caseload eligibility costs as a result of reducing the redetermination requirement from every 6 months to every 12 months.

### FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act for cases meeting eligibility criteria, with the level of FFP based on the FMAP rate. Funding for the nonfederal share of federal program costs and for cases not meeting federal eligibility criteria is 40 percent State General Fund and 60 percent county funds.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The CY estimate is held to the Appropriation.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY increase is based on projected caseload eligibility costs.

### ADMINISTRATIVE:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
Total	-\$10,621	-\$10,570
Federal	-5,311	-5,285
State	-3,717	-3,717
County	-1,593	-1,568
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Food Stamp Administrative Reduction

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the reduction in federal reimbursement of California's food stamp administrative costs based on amounts charged to the former Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) Program that could have been allocated to the Food Stamps and Medi-Cal programs for common administrative costs. Section 501 of the Agriculture Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (Public Law (P.L.) 105-185) required states to determine such common administrative costs during the State's Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program base year, Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 1995.

The TANF block grant, which replaced the AFDC Program, is based on the historical spending levels of the former program. With the elimination of the AFDC Program and the approval of revised public assistance cost allocation plans, the federal Office of Management and Budgets (OMB) cost principles applicable to the states (OMB Circular A-87) required that common costs be allocated to all benefiting programs. Consequently, California had to determine the amount of common costs attributable to eligibility determinations charged to AFDC that could have been allocated to the Food Stamp (FS) Program. In order to assist in this process, the federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) issued a guide entitled, "Implementation of Cost Allocation Determinations under the Agriculture Research, Extension and Education Reform Act." This guide provided direction to the states in determining their AFDC total base year administrative expenditures. California reviewed the base year's cost allocation methodology and the administrative costs charged to the AFDC Program. The California Department of Social Services used a primary program cost allocation methodology rather than a benefiting program cost allocation methodology for the county administrative costs during the TANF block grant base year, FFY 1995. As a result, California received federal approval of its proposed reduction amount on January 15, 1999.

The amount attributable to food stamps is to be deducted from food stamps administrative claims. The provisions of P.L. 105-185 stipulate that states may not use TANF funds to pay for this reduction, nor does it provide for a decrease in the maintenance of effort expenditures under TANF.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1998.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: P.L. 105-185, section 501.
- Based on a review of quarterly federal financial reports submitted to DHHS during FFY 1995, the total federal share of common administrative expenditures was \$280,097,927.
- Non-AFDC Program administrative costs and discrete AFDC costs, as defined in the guide, were identified in quarterly federal financial reports. These costs, as well as other allowable adjustments stipulated in the guide, totaled \$59,412,705 and were deducted from the total federal share of common administrative expenditures.
- California's AFDC total base year administrative expenditure is \$220,685,222.



## Food Stamp Administrative Reduction

### METHODOLOGY:

- California elected to use the optional formula described in the guide to determine the amount of the FS administrative reimbursement reduction. The optional formula is to multiply the AFDC total base year administrative expenditure by 80 percent and divide by three (for the three benefiting programs of AFDC, FS, and Medi-Cal).
- California's FS administrative reimbursement reduction is \$58,849,393 ( $\$220,685,222 \times 0.80 \div 3$ ).
- Assuming that the TANF block grant will be reauthorized at the same level, California will continue to reflect the reduction to the FS administrative claims.

### FUNDING:

The cost is funded with 100 percent State General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	-58,849	-58,849
State	58,849	58,849
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Food Stamp Sanction Reinvestment

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs associated with a sanction imposed on the State by the United States Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) due to county quality control (QC) error rates being above the national averages for federal fiscal year (FFY) 2001, FFY 2002, and FFY 2003. The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and the FNS have negotiated a settlement agreement which would hold "at risk" a total of \$62.5 million (or \$12.5 million per year) in relation to California's food stamp error rate over the period FFY 2003-07. The error rate target for this period is 7.4 percent. Reinvestment by the State or waiver by FNS, of all or a portion of \$12.5 million each year shall be contingent upon the level of payment accuracy the state achieves during each year.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

Food Stamp sanction reinvestment activities are expected to begin in Fiscal Year 2005-06.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The federal food stamp sanction is imposed pursuant to Title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 275.23.
- The State achieved a payment error rate of 7.96 percent in FFY 2003; therefore pursuant to the settlement agreement the State must reinvest \$1,000,000 for program improvements by January 2006.
- The State's payment error rate was 6.32 percent in FFY 2004. Therefore, funding for reinvestment activities is not necessary in the budget year.
- All reinvestment expenditures shall be unmatched with federal funds and shall be in addition to the cost of the minimum program administration required by law and regulation.
- County expenditures on food stamp reinvestment activities are not countable towards their maintenance of effort requirement in the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids and Food Stamp programs.
- The CDSS Manual of Policies and Procedures, Division 15, Chapter 15-621, allows a portion of the Food Stamp sanction imposed on the State to be passed on to those Performance Sample Counties whose program payment error rate exceeded the federal tolerance level during the FFY for which the sanction was incurred.

### METHODOLOGY:

The \$1 million reinvestment activities for improving operations in the Food Stamp program will be shared 10.4 percent by the State and 89.6 percent by the counties.

## Food Stamp Sanction Reinvestment

### FUNDING:

Reinvestment activities are funded with 10.4 percent State General Fund and 89.6 percent county funds.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The State was within the national tolerance level in FFY 2004. Therefore, funding for reinvestment activities is not necessary in the budget year.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,000	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	104	0
County	896	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Food Stamp Employment and Training Program

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the Food Stamp Employment and Training (FSET) Program, which provides job search assistance, work experience and supportive services to eligible Non-Assistance Food Stamp Program recipients. This program was established under the Food Security Act of 1985 (Public Law (P.L.) 99-198). Employment and training opportunities enable recipients to become self-sufficient and reduce their need for food stamps. Some participants are geographically excluded due to reasons such as sparse population, great distances and lack of transportation. Individual county plans are developed that specify the job services, training and supportive services available to participants.

The United States Department of Agriculture Food and Nutrition Service (USDA-FNS) provides unmatched federal employment and training funding each year. The Food Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2002 (Public Law 107-171), signed into law on May 13, 2002, and effective October 1, 2002, made significant changes to the FSET Program. The changes include freezing the base unmatched federal funds at the Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2002 level through FFY 2007, adding certain criteria for a second component of unmatched federal funds each year from FFY 2002 through FFY 2007, eliminating a maintenance of effort requirement retroactive to October 1, 2001, rescinding carry-over of unmatched federal funds from years prior to FFY 2002 (unless states have already obligated the funds prior to the date of enactment), and changing the federal formula for allocating FSET funds to states. In addition, the legislation eliminated a \$175 and \$30 limit for offered and filled slots, a \$25 limit on participant reimbursement for transportation and ancillary costs and an 80/20 spending requirement for Able Bodied Adult Without Dependents (ABAWDs) in qualifying FSET activities.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on April 1, 1987.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 18901.
- There are 26 counties participating in the FSET Program.
- The State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2005-06 costs for this program are based on local assistance costs identified in the approved FSET Program State Plans for FFY 2005 and FFY 2006.
- The SFY 2006-07 costs for this program are based on the local assistance costs identified in the FSET Program state plans approved for FFY 2006.

### METHODOLOGY:

- SFY 2005-06 represent 25 percent of the total amount of the approved FFY 2005 FSET Program State Plan and 75 percent of the total amount of the approved FFY 2006 FSET Program State Plan.
- SFY 2006-07 represents 100 percent of the amount in the approved FFY 2006 FSET Program state plan.

## Food Stamp Employment and Training Program

### FUNDING:

The costs in excess of the enhanced funding cap and for participant reimbursement are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent county.<sup>1</sup>

<b><u>2005-06:</u></b> (in 000's)	<b><u>Total</u></b>	<b><u>Federal</u></b>	<b><u>State (cap)</u></b>	<b><u>County</u></b>
Enhanced Funds (100 percent)	\$9,544	\$9,544	\$0	\$0
Normal Funds <sup>1</sup>	\$45,392	\$22,696	\$0	\$22,696
Participant Reimbursement	<u>\$7,736</u>	<u>\$3,868</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$3,868</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$62.672</b>	<b>\$36.108</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$26.564</b>

<b><u>2006-07:</u></b> (in 000's)	<b><u>Total</u></b>	<b><u>Federal</u></b>	<b><u>State (cap)</u></b>	<b><u>County</u></b>
Enhanced Funds (100 percent)	\$9,544	\$9,544	\$0	\$0
Normal Funds <sup>1</sup>	\$45,392	\$22,696	\$0	\$22,696
Participant Reimbursement	<u>\$6,000</u>	<u>\$3,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$3,000</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$60.936</b>	<b>\$35.240</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$25.696</b>

<sup>1</sup> - Normal funds are used once costs exceed the enhanced funding cap and participant reimbursement costs.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The costs were updated to reflect federally approved funding levels.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$62,672	\$60,936
Federal	36,108	35,240
State	0	0
County	26,564	25,696
Reimbursements	0	0

## California Nutrition Network

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of federal matching funds that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) passes through to the Department of Health Services (DHS). The California Nutrition Network is a statewide marketing campaign to promote healthy eating and physical activity among food stamp recipients. The Network is a collaborative effort among DHS, CDSS, California Department of Education, University of California Cooperative Extension, and private agencies. The California Nutrition Network partners with faith communities, local health departments, parks and recreation departments, and school districts. DHS is the lead agency administering the project. CDSS serves as the pass-through agency for the matching federal funds.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1996.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The budget proposed to the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2006 of \$96,010,620 was used to estimate funding for the current year (CY).
- The budget year (BY) assumes continuation of the CY funding level.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The CY estimate is based on the proposed funding for FFY 2006.
- The BY estimate is based on the CY funding level.

### FUNDING:

The pass-through consists of 100 percent FNS federal funds.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## California Nutrition Network

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$96,011	\$96,011
Federal	96,011	96,011
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## UC Food Stamp Nutrition Education Plan

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of federal matching funds that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) passes through to the University of California Cooperative Extension (UCCE). Food stamp applicants and recipients will be provided nutrition education services in 41 counties by local university county extension offices. California's Food Stamp Nutrition Education Plan is a cooperative effort between CDSS and UCCE. CDSS serves as the pass-through agency for the matching federal funds.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1995.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The budget proposed to the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2006 of \$6,596,597 was used to estimate funding for the current year (CY).
- The budget year (BY) assumes continuation of the CY funding level.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The CY estimate is based on the proposed funding for FFY 2006.
- The BY estimate is based on the CY funding level.

### FUNDING:

The pass-through consists of 100 percent FNS federal funds.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$6,597	\$6,597
Federal	6,597	6,597
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0



***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Transitional Benefits

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide for a Transitional Food Stamp (TFS) Program to households terminating their participation in the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program. Assembly Bill (AB) 231 (Chapter 743, Statutes of 2003) mandated, to the maximum extent allowable by federal law, each county welfare department to provide transitional food stamp benefits to households terminating their participation in the CalWORKs program without the need to re-establish food stamp eligibility. The household may receive up to five months of benefits. Benefits would be the same as the amount received by the household prior to their termination from CalWORKs, adjusted for the loss of the CalWORKs grant.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented January 1, 2004.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 18901.6
- This premise reflects costs for automation reprogramming and manual workarounds.
- Processing will be done manually until reprogramming is completed. Based on county experience it is assumed that it will take 15 minutes to manually process a TFS case at a cost of \$14.57 per case.
- There will be 16,567 cases requiring manual processing in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06.
- It will cost \$0.3 million in FY 2005-06 to reprogram existing systems to implement TFS based on information from the Office of Systems Integration.
- This premise assumes automation reprogramming will be completed in the current year (CY) eliminating the need for manual workarounds in the budget year (BY).

### METHODOLOGY:

The administrative costs for manual workarounds are calculated by multiplying the number of TFS cases by the cost per manual workaround.

### FUNDING:

The funding for Non-Assistance Food Stamps administrative cost is 50 percent federal, 35 percent state, and 15 percent county. The automation reprogramming funds are shared the same as the consortia funding.

## Transitional Benefits

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The CY increase reflects an increase in the number of cases requiring manual workarounds.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY decrease reflects full implementation of automation reprogramming and elimination of manual workarounds.

### EXPENDITURES:

FS Program Costs	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$563	\$0
Federal	279	0
State	200	0
County	84	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Simplification Options

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the impact to Federal Food Stamp Administration and the California Food Assistance Program (CFAP) associated with the implementation of certain optional provisions allowed by the Federal Government. These options are designed to simplify the Food Stamp Program by easing administrative processes and by aligning certain aspects of the Food Stamp Program with the CalWORKs Program such as: 1) allowing the food stamp program to adopt certain income exclusions (educational loans, grants, scholarships, and child support disregard) and resource exemptions (restricted accounts, Individual Development Accounts (IDA), and Individual Retirement Accounts (IRA) consistent with the CalWORKs Program, thereby increasing benefits for eligible recipients; and 2) allowing for the treatment of child support payments to a non-participating household member to be treated as an income exclusion rather than a deduction for the person paying the child support; and 3) requiring the use of the Standard Utility Allowance (SUA) instead of allowing households the option of choosing the standard or actual costs.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement October 1, 2006.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002 (Public Law, 107-171), Food Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2002.
- The Public Assistance Food Stamps (PAFS) caseload is based on the May 2006 CalWORKs projected caseload excluding Safety Net cases. The CalWORKs monthly average caseload for the last nine months in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07 is 430,457.
- Based on FFY 2002 CalWORKs Characteristics Survey, 84.80 percent of CalWORKs cases receive Food Stamps.
- The Non-Assistance Food Stamps (NAFS) caseload is based on the May 2006 NAFS projected caseload trend. The NAFS monthly average caseload for the last nine months in FY 2006-07 is 484,543.
- The CFAP caseload is based on the May 2006 CalWORKs and NAFS projected trend forecasts. The CFAP average monthly caseload for the last nine months in FY 2006-07 is 8,392.
- The ratio between CFAP PAFS and NAFS is 24.40 percent PAFS and 75.60 percent NAFS.
- Based on the DFA 296 - Food Stamp Program Monthly Caseload Movement Statistical Report from calendar year 2005, the denied NAFS/CFAP applicants are equivalent to 4.16 percent of the number of the NAFS/CFAP caseload.
- It is assumed that it will cost \$51.00 per case for an Eligibility Worker (EW) to process new NAFS and CFAP cases.
- It is assumed that it will cost \$33.69 per case for an EW to process NAFS and CFAP continuing cases on a quarterly basis.

## **Simplification Options**

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):**

- It is assumed that 7.20 percent of the new cumulative caseload would be subject to mid-quarter reporting.
- It is assumed that it will cost \$28.23 for an EW to process a mid-quarter report. The EW salary per hour is \$58.27 for NAFS/CFAP.
- Based on actual data reported on the DFA 256, Food Stamp Program Participation and Benefit Issuance Report from FY 2004-05, the average CFAP coupon value per case is \$210.60.

### **Income Exclusions**

- The exclusion of certain types of income results in an increase of NAFS/CFAP eligible cases.
- Based on Q5 data for FFY 2002, 0.3 percent of the NAFS/CFAP caseload receives educational loans, scholarships, or grants.
- Based on county experience, it currently requires 15 minutes of an EW time semiannually to process cases with educational loans, scholarships, or grant income. Therefore excluding these types of income will result in an annual savings of \$29.14 per case.

### **Child Support Disregard**

- The exclusion of the child support disregard results in administrative savings associated with the food stamp benefit determination and increased benefits for those receiving child support disregard.
- The child support disregard applies only to PAFS cases.
- Based on data from the Department of Child Support Services, 10.43 percent of CalWORKs/CFAP cases receive child support disregard.
- Based on county experience, it currently requires 10 minutes of an EW time quarterly to process cases with the child support disregard. Therefore, excluding the child support disregard will result in a quarterly savings of \$9.71 per case.
- The exclusion of the child support disregard as income in benefit determination will result in a benefit increase of \$22.73 per case.

### **Resource Exemptions**

- The exemption of certain types of resources results in an increase of NAFS/CFAP eligible cases.
- Based on CA 255 CW - CalWORKs Report on Reasons for Denials and Other Non-Approvals of Applications from July 2003 through June 2004, 3 percent of CalWORKs denials result from excess resources. Absent similar data for Food Stamp cases, the CalWORKs experience will be assumed to apply to Food Stamps.

## Simplification Options

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- Based on a county survey, 3 percent of NAFS/CFAP cases that are denied due to excess resources have restricted accounts, IDA, and IRA.

### Child Support

- The treatment of child support payments to a non-participating household member as an income exclusion results in an increase of NAFS/CFAP eligible cases.
- Based on a county survey, 1 percent of NAFS/CFAP denied applicants pay child support.

### SUA/Limited Utility Allowance (LUA)

- The implementation of a mandatory SUA also requires implementation of a LUA. The LUA includes expenses for items such as water, sewer, trash, and telephone.
- The LUA is for households that do not qualify for the SUA.
- The mandatory SUA would decrease benefits for those claiming actual utility expenses.
- Based on the FFY 2003 Food Stamps Characteristics Survey, approximately 0.02 percent of Food Stamp/CFAP caseload qualify for the SUA, but claim actuals and approximately 1.28 percent of the Food Stamp/CFAP caseload qualify for the LUA.
- Effective August 2006, the SUA is \$271.
- The average monthly actual utility costs claimed for those that qualify for the SUA is \$350.
- The mandatory SUA will result in decreased benefits of \$35.91 per case for cases claiming actuals.
- It is assumed that the LUA will be established at a rate similar to the actual expenses claimed therefore, the LUA will not have a significant impact to benefits.
- It is assumed that utility expenses are determined by the EW at intake and during the annual re-certification.
- Intake cases represent 6.0 percent of total Food Stamp households.
- Based on county experience, it currently requires 10 minutes of an EW time to calculate actual utility expenses. Therefore, mandating the SUA/LUA will result in a savings of \$9.71 per impacted case.

## Simplification Options

### METHODOLOGY:

- The new monthly cases due to excluding certain income are calculated by multiplying the projected NAFS/CFAP average monthly caseload by 4.16 percent and 0.3 percent.
- The new cases due to exempting certain resources are calculated by multiplying the projected NAFS/CFAP average monthly caseload by 4.16 percent and 3 percent then by 3 percent.
- The new cases due to excluding child support income are calculated by multiplying the projected NAFS/CFAP average monthly caseload by 4.16 percent and by 1 percent.
- The monthly administrative costs associated with processing the new cases due to income exclusions, child support income exclusion and resource exemptions are calculated by multiplying the new monthly cases by \$51.00.
- The monthly administrative costs associated with processing the mid-quarter changes for the new cases due to income exclusions, child support income exclusion and resource exemptions are calculated by multiplying the new cumulative cases by 7.20 percent and by \$28.23.
- The quarterly administrative costs associated with processing the quarterly reports for the new cases due to income exclusions, child support income exclusion and resource exemptions are calculated by multiplying the new cumulative cases by \$33.69 on a quarterly basis.
- The administrative savings associated with the income exclusion is calculated by multiplying the caseload by \$29.14 semiannually.
- The CFAP coupon costs associated with the new cases due to income exclusions, child support income exclusion and resource exemptions are calculated by multiplying the related caseload by the average CFAP coupon cost.
- The existing cases that will be impacted due to excluding the child support disregard are calculated by multiplying the CalWORKs average monthly caseload by 84.8 percent and 10.43 percent.
- The administrative savings associated with the elimination of the child support disregard is calculated by multiplying the caseload by \$9.71 quarterly.
- The impacted CFAP caseload due to excluding the child support disregard is calculated by multiplying the PAFS CFAP caseload by 10.43 percent.
- The coupon costs associated with the exclusion of the child support disregard as income is calculated by multiplying the impacted CFAP caseload by \$22.73.
- The cases that will be impacted by requiring the use of a SUA are calculated by multiplying the impacted Food Stamp/CFAP caseload by 0.02 percent.
- The administrative savings associated with requiring the use of a SUA is calculated by multiplying the impacted Food Stamp/CFAP caseload by \$9.71.
- The coupon savings associated with requiring the use of a SUA is calculated by multiplying the impacted CFAP caseload by \$35.91.

## Simplification Options

### METHODOLOGY (continued):

- The cases that will be impacted by implementing a LUA are calculated by multiplying the impacted Food Stamp/CFAP caseload by 1.28 percent.
- The administrative savings associated with implementing a LUA is calculated by multiplying the impacted Food Stamp/CFAP caseload by \$9.71.

### FUNDING:

The Food Stamp sharing ratio for the administrative cost/savings is 50 percent federal, 35 percent state, and 15 percent county funds. These county costs are countable towards their Maintenance of Effort (MOE). The CFAP funding is 100 percent State General Fund (GF). The PAFS CFAP costs are eligible to be counted towards the TANF MOE requirement. The automation reprogramming funds are shared consistent with the consortia funding.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The caseload and data source for determining the ratio of denied NAFS/CFAP applicants to the total NAFS/CFAP caseload has been updated.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise implements in October 2006.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

101 - CFAP	2005-06	2006-07
	Grants	Grants
Total	\$0	\$90
Federal	0	0
State	0	90
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0



## Simplification Options

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

<b>141-Food Stamp Administration<sup>1</sup></b>	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	-\$1,042
Federal	0	-521
State	0	-365
County	0	-156
Reimbursements	0	0
 <b>141-Automation</b>	 2005-06	 2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$ 0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

---

<sup>1</sup> These costs include CFAP administrative costs.

---

## Income Exclusion for Deployed Military

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects administrative costs associated with excluding military pay received by military personnel deployed to a designated combat zone as mandated by the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005, Public Law 108-447, signed by the President on December 8, 2004.

This new law requires that the combat pay be excluded when determining the amount of food stamp benefits, and authorizes retroactivity back to October 1, 2004. Any household that had an increase in income due to the combat pay that was counted in their food stamp case as of October 1, 2004 is entitled to restoration of lost benefits. If it becomes known that a household was previously denied food stamp benefits due to this excludable income, a restoration of lost benefits must also be computed for the household.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on March 1, 2005.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing Statute: Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005, Public Law 108-447.
  - The Non-Assistance Food Stamps (NAFS) caseload is based on the May 2006 NAFS projected caseload trend. The NAFS monthly average caseload for new cases is 452,471 in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and 479,752 for FY 2006-07.
  - The counties with military bases represent 68 percent of the total NAFS caseload based on the DFA 256 - NAFS Program Participation and Benefit Issuance Report for FY 2004-05.
  - Based on the DFA 296 - Food Stamp Program Monthly Caseload Movement Statistical Report from calendar year 2005, the denied NAFS applicants are equivalent to 4.16 percent of the NAFS caseload.
  - Based on the CalWORKs Report on Reasons for Discontinuances of Cash Grant, (CA 253 CW) for FY 2003-04, 11.25 percent of the cases are discontinued due to income exceeding CalWORKs eligibility limits. Absent similar data for Food Stamp cases, the CalWORKs experience will be assumed to apply to Food Stamps.
  - Based on a survey from counties with military bases, 0.27 percent of the existing cases and 0.27 percent of the cases denied due to excessive income would be impacted by this change.
  - It is assumed that it will cost \$51.00 per case for an Eligibility Worker (EW) to process new NAFS cases to exclude combat pay when determining the amount of food stamp benefits.
  - It is assumed that it will cost an additional \$32.88 per case for an EW to process new NAFS cases to exclude combat pay when determining the amount of food stamp benefits.
  - It is assumed that 7.20 percent of the new cumulative caseload would be subject to mid-quarter reporting.
  - It is assumed that it will cost \$28.23 for an EW to process a mid-quarter report.
  - It is assumed that it will cost \$33.69 per case for an EW to process NAFS continuing cases on a quarterly basis.
-

## **Income Exclusion for Deployed Military**

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):**

- It is assumed that it will cost \$9.71 per case for an EW to manually calculate benefits retroactively each month for new cases deemed eligible from October 2004.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

- The new cases expected to become eligible due to this change are calculated by multiplying the projected NAFS average monthly caseload by 68 percent and 4.16 percent and 11.25 percent and by 0.27 percent.
- The monthly intake cost associated with processing the new cases is calculated by multiplying the new monthly cases by \$51.00.
- The monthly additional administrative cost associated with processing the new cases is calculated by multiplying the new monthly cases by \$32.88.
- The monthly administrative cost associated with processing the mid-quarter changes for the new cases is calculated by multiplying the new cumulative cases by 7.20 percent and by \$28.23.
- The quarterly administrative cost associated with processing the quarterly reports for the new cases is calculated by multiplying the new cumulative cases by \$33.69 on a quarterly basis.
- The administrative cost associated with manually calculating benefits each month is calculated by multiplying the new cases by the number of retroactive months and by \$9.71.

### **FUNDING:**

The Food Stamp sharing ratio for the administrative cost is 50 percent federal, 35 percent state, and 15 percent county funds.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The automation costs will be absorbed within the consortia's baseline.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The budget year increase is due to a caseload increase.

## Income Exclusion for Deployed Military

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

<b>141 – Food</b>	2005-06	2006-07
<b>Administration</b>	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$9	\$15
Federal	5	8
State	3	5
County	1	2
Reimbursements	0	0
<b>141 – Automation</b>	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Refugee Cash Assistance – Administration

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs necessary to perform the administrative functions of the Refugee Cash Assistance (RCA) Program. The RCA Program provides cash grants to refugees during their first eight months in the United States (U.S.) if they are not otherwise eligible for the standard categorical welfare programs. The RCA administrative costs include salaries and benefits of eligibility workers and first line supervisors who determine eligibility and provide ongoing case management for the RCA Program. Also included are allocated overhead and direct costs.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on March 17, 1980.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Section 1522 of Title 8 of the United States Code (U.S.C.) authorizes the federal government to provide grants to the states to assist refugees who resettle in the U.S.
- Sections 13275 through 13282 of the Welfare and Institutions Code authorize the Department to administer the funds provided under Title 8 of the U.S.C. It also provides the Department authority to allocate the federal funds to the counties.
- Based on data through December 2005, the average administrative monthly cost per RCA case was \$126.13.
- The average monthly caseload is 1,363 for FY 2005-06. The average monthly caseload is projected at 1,469 for FY 2006-07.

### METHODOLOGY:

The average cost per case for RCA administration is multiplied by the estimated caseload for each fiscal year to arrive at the total cost.

### FUNDING:

This program is 100 percent federally funded with the Cash, Medical and Administration Grant through the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year estimate has increased due to a higher average monthly caseload and administrative cost per case than previously estimated.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Total costs increase due to a projected caseload increase of 7.8 percent in FY 2006-07.

## Refugee Cash Assistance – Administration

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$2,316	\$2,223
Federal	2,316	2,223
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **SAWS Statewide Project Management**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects costs for the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Statewide Project Management. This activity is performed by the California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration (OSI) in accordance with Welfare and Institutions Code Section 10823(a), which requires the implementation of SAWS. The OSI provides statewide project management for the four SAWS consortia and the Welfare Data Tracking Implementation Project.

The OSI provides state-level project management, including securing project approvals and funding, procuring and managing specialized technical consultant services and other contract services, monitoring consortia implementation and operations, reviewing and approving selected consortia deliverables, applying early issue identification and resolution methods, managing risk, managing stakeholder involvement, and approving and tracking expenditures. Consortia are responsible for defining county-level system requirements, and for the competitive procurement of system hardware and software development, implementation support, and maintenance and operations of the consortia systems.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 1995.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 10823.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Costs are based on the December 2001 (Revised May 2002) SAWS Statewide Project Management Implementation Advance Planning Document Update (IAPDU) and subsequent baseline adjustments.

### **FUNDING:**

Statewide Project Management funding comes from various sources. Federal funds include the normal share of Food Stamp, Title IV-E and Refugee Resettlement program funding. The project is eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is budgeted by the Department of Health Services. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program block grant is the funding source for TANF eligible costs. The balance of the funding is State General Fund. Based on the cost allocation plan for the project, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program is 100 percent TANF eligible. Project-related TANF funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The allocation of costs to benefiting programs was updated for Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07. The current year and budget year decrease reflects a technical adjustment.



## SAWS Statewide Project Management

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in FY 2006-07 is due to baseline adjustments for a pro-rata increase and retirement contributions.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$6,126	\$6,347
Federal	1,774	1,793
State	2,620	2,712
County	0	0
Reimbursements	1,732	1,842

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$6,126	\$6,347
CDSS	68	56
OSI	6,058	6,291

## **Welfare Data Tracking Implementation Project (WDTIP)**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects costs for the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) - Welfare Data Tracking Implementation Project (WDTIP). Project management for WDTIP is provided by the California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration (OSI). WDTIP provides counties with the automated functionality required to conform to statewide tracking of time-on-aid requirements mandated by welfare reform in Chapter 270, Statutes of 1997 (AB 1542).

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 1999.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11454.5(b)(4).

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Costs are based on the June 2002 (Revised January 2003) SAWS-WDTIP Implementation Advance Planning Document Update and subsequent baseline adjustments.

### **FUNDING:**

SAWS-WDTIP funding is 100 percent California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs)/Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). Based on the cost allocation plan for the project, the federal share of the CalWORKs Program is 100 percent TANF eligible. Project-related TANF funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The current year and budget year decrease reflects a technical adjustment.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The increase in Fiscal Year 2006-07 is due to baseline adjustments for a pro-rata increase and retirement contributions.

## Welfare Data Tracking Implementation Project (WDTIP)

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$3,861	\$3,937
Federal	3,861	3,937
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$3,861	\$3,937
CDSS	3,000	3,000
OSI	861	937

## **Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System (ISAWS)**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs for the ISAWS Consortium, one of four consortia within the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Project. The Office of Systems Integration (OSI) provides statewide project management for SAWS. In addition, OSI provides application maintenance and operational support services for the ISAWS Consortium. The computing services are provided by the Department of Technology Services. The Consortium is comprised of 35 counties.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 1994.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10823.
- The ISAWS estimate reflects ongoing maintenance and operations costs.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Costs reflect the baseline budget established when the project was closed out in August 2004 and adjustments made in the Governor's Budget.

### **FUNDING:**

ISAWS funding comes from various sources. Federal funds include the normal shares of Food Stamp, Title IV-E and Refugee Resettlement Programs funding. Also, the project is eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is budgeted by the Department of Health Services. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program block grant is the funding source for TANF-eligible costs. The balance of the funding is State General Fund (GF) and the county share of Food Stamp and Title IV-E costs. Based on the cost allocation plan for the project, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program is 100 percent TANF-eligible. Project-related TANF funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The allocation of costs to benefiting programs was updated for Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07. The budget year (BY) decrease reflects a technical adjustment.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The BY increase reflects baseline adjustments for a pro-rata increase and retirement contributions.

## Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System (ISAWS)

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$36,354	\$36,753
Federal	11,544	11,794
State	14,194	14,333
County	0	0
Reimbursements	10,616	10,626

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$36,354	\$36,753
CDSS	2,139	2,919
OSI	\$34,215	33,834

## **Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System (ISAWS) Consortium Migration Project**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects costs for the Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System (ISAWS) Consortium Migration Project. The ISAWS Consortium is one of the four consortia within the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Project. The California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration provides state level project management for SAWS. The ISAWS Consortium Migration Project will migrate the 35 ISAWS Consortium counties to Consortium IV.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise will implement in July 2006.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 10823.
- Planning activities are scheduled to begin in July 2006.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Costs are based on the March 2006 SAWS-ISAWS Consortium Migration Project Planning Advance Planning Document Update.

### **FUNDING:**

ISAWS Migration funding comes from various sources. Federal funds include the normal shares of Food Stamp and Refugee Resettlement program funding. The project is eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is budgeted by the Department of Health Services. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program block grant is the funding source for TANF-eligible costs. The balance of the funding is State General Fund. Based on the cost allocation plan for the project, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program is 100 percent TANF-eligible. Project-related TANF funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The start date for the project has changed from March 1, 2006 to July 1, 2006, which shifts all FY 2005/06 costs into FY 2006-07.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The project will start July 1, 2006.

## Interim Statewide Automated Welfare System (ISAWS) Consortium Migration Project

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$2,833
Federal	0	892
State	0	1,262
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	679

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$0	\$2,833
CDSS	0	2,531
OSI	0	302

## **Los Angeles Eligibility, Automated Determination, Evaluation and Reporting (LEADER)**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs for the Los Angeles Eligibility, Automated Determination, Evaluation and Reporting (LEADER) Consortium, one of four consortia within the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Project. The California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration (OSI) provides state level project management for SAWS. The LEADER Consortium includes only Los Angeles County.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 1994.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 10823.
- The LEADER estimate reflects ongoing maintenance and operations (M&O) costs and planning costs for the LEADER Replacement System project.
- The county extended its M&O contract for 24 months beginning in May 2005 and will extend it again beginning in May 2007 in order to continue M&O services until the replacement system has been implemented.
- The LEADER Replacement System planning activities began in July 2005 and will continue through June 2007.
- Unexpended Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05 funds have been reappropriated to FY 2005-06.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Costs are based on the June 2005 SAWS-LEADER Implementation Advance Planning Document Update and the June 2005 (Revised November 2005) SAWS-LEADER Replacement System Planning Advance Planning Document Update.

### **FUNDING:**

LEADER funding comes from various sources. Federal funds include the normal shares of Food Stamp and Refugee Resettlement program funding. Also, the project is eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is included in the Department of Health Services budget. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program block grant is the funding source for TANF-eligible costs. The balance of the funding is State General Fund and the county share of Food Stamp and General Relief costs. Based on the cost allocation plan for the project, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program is 100 percent TANF eligible. Project-related TANF funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.



## Los Angeles Eligibility, Automated Determination, Evaluation and Reporting (LEADER)

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The allocation of costs to benefiting programs was updated for FY 2006-07.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year M&O increase reflects estimated rate increases for the additional contract extension period beginning in May 2007. The increase is offset by a slight reduction in planning costs.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$10,581	\$11,753
Federal	5,561	6,244
State	2,700	3,121
County	1,404	1,550
Reimbursements	916	838

### LEADER Reappropriation:\*

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$589	\$0
Federal	315	0
State	274	0
County	0	0

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$10,581	\$11,753
CDSS	10,581	11,753
OSI	0	0

\* This is a non-add item.

## Welfare Client Data System (WCDS) –

## CalWORKS Information Network (CalWIN)

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs for the Welfare Client Data System (WCDS) Consortium, one of the four consortia within the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Project. The California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration (OSI) provides state level project management for SAWS. The WCDS Consortium is comprised of 18 counties.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 10823.
- Implementation activities began in February 2000.
- Implementation activities are scheduled to be completed in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07.

### METHODOLOGY:

Costs are based on the June 2005 (Revised November 2005) SAWS-WCDS Consortium Implementation Advance Planning Document Update.

### FUNDING:

WCDS funding comes from various sources. Federal funds include the normal shares of Food Stamp and Refugee Resettlement Programs funding. Also, the project is eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is budgeted by the Department of Health Services. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program block grant is the funding source for TANF-eligible costs. The balance of the funding is State General Fund, and the county share of Food Stamp, Foster Care and General Assistance/General Relief costs. Based on the cost allocation plan for the project, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program is 100 percent TANF-eligible. Project-related TANF funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The allocation of costs to benefiting programs was updated for FY 2006-07.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease in FY 2006-07 reflects the completion of consortium-wide implementation activities in early FY 2006-07.

## **Welfare Client Data System (WCDS) – CalWORKS Information Network (CalWIN)**

### **EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$153,833	\$117,488
Federal	61,767	39,712
State	56,434	44,332
County	4,374	5,152
Reimbursements	31,258	28,292

### **CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:**

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$153,833	\$117,488
CDSS	153,833	117,488
OSI	0	0

## **Consortium IV (C-IV)**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs for Consortium IV (C-IV), one of four consortia within the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) Project. The California Health and Human Services Agency, Office of Systems Integration (OSI) provides state level project management for SAWS. Consortium IV is comprised of four counties.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 10823.
- Implementation activities began March 1, 2001 and were completed in November 2004.
- The C-IV estimate reflects ongoing maintenance and operations (M&O) costs.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Costs are based on the June 2005 (Revised November 2005) SAWS-C-IV Implementation Advance Planning Document Update.

### **FUNDING:**

C-IV funding comes from various sources. Federal funds include the normal shares of Food Stamp and Refugee Resettlement program funding. The project is eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is budgeted by the Department of Health Services. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program block grant is the funding source for TANF-eligible costs. The balance of the funding is State General Fund and the county share of Food Stamp and Foster Care costs. Based on the cost allocation plan for the project, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program is 100 percent TANF-eligible. Project-related TANF funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The allocation of costs to benefiting programs was updated for FY 2006-07.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The increase in FY 2006-07 reflects funding to support additional county staff during M&O and to accommodate a contractually required inflation adjustment for contractor services.

## Consortium IV (C-IV)

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$45,466	\$48,751
Federal	17,176	17,965
State	15,936	17,344
County	1,667	2,058
Reimbursements	10,687	11,384

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$45,466	\$48,751
CDSS	45,466	48,751
OSI	0	0

# **Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) and California Child Support Automated System (CCSAS) Interface**

## **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects costs for the testing activities associated with an interface between the Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) consortium systems and the California Child Support Automated System (CCSAS). These testing activities are necessary to ensure the successful exchange of data between the SAWS systems and the CCSAS when CCSAS is implemented statewide. The implementation schedule for CCSAS requires that testing occur during Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07.

## **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise will implement on July 1, 2006.

## **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10823.

## **METHODOLOGY:**

Costs are based on workload estimates for the SAWS consortia testing activities.

## **FUNDING:**

Federal funds include the normal share of Title IV-E program funding. The project is eligible for Title XIX federal funding, which is budgeted by the Department of Health Services. The Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program block grant is the funding source for TANF eligible costs. The balance of the funding is State General Fund and county funds. Based on the cost allocation plan, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Program is 100 percent TANF eligible. Project-related TANF funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

## **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

This is a new premise.

## **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

This is a new premise.

## Statewide Automated Welfare System (SAWS) and California Child Support Automated System (CCSAS) Interface

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$1,459
Federal	0	354
State	0	557
County	0	6
Reimbursements	0	542

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$0	\$1,459
CDSS	0	731
OSI	0	728

---

## Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System (SFIS) Project

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost for SFIS. Senate Bill 1780 (Chapter 206, Statutes of 1996) required applicants for, and recipients of California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs), Non-Assistance Food Stamp (NAFS), and California Food Assistance Program benefits to be fingerprint imaged as a condition of eligibility.

The following persons must provide fingerprint images and a photo image: (1) each parent and/or caretaker relative of an aided or applicant child when living in the home of the child; (2) each parent and/or caretaker relative receiving or applying for aid on the basis of an unaided excluded child; (3) each aided or applicant adult; and, (4) the aided or applicant pregnant woman in an assistance unit (AU) consisting of the woman only. Failure to provide the required images will result in ineligibility for the entire AU.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The first phase of counties began implementation on March 14, 2000. The statewide implementation of SFIS was completed on December 7, 2001.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10830.
- The Health and Human Services Agency-Office of Systems Integration cost estimates reflected in this premise are based on the negotiated contract with the SFIS development contractor that was a result of the second procurement effort (RFP HWDC-8001). Cost estimates are based on the following:
  - Maintenance and operations (M&O) vendor – The maintenance and operations vendor contract estimate is based on a structured monthly lease and maintenance cost for state and county-operated workstations and a “per transaction” cost. The “per transaction” cost includes: vendor project staff; help desk when the system is operational; fingerprint examiners; system operators; lease/maintenance costs for host computer(s) (i.e., central site); and software development and maintenance.
  - Quality Assurance vendor – Quality Assurance staff will be utilized to assure the state that the M&O vendor is providing the promised product at the lowest cost, and to reduce any risk factors during the maintenance and operations phase of the project.
  - Change control – Change control is necessary since there are always items not addressed in the RFP, which require changes in the program(s). These can be legislative, interface, capacity or workload changes that affect the new system.

### METHODOLOGY:

The current cost estimates are based on the negotiated contract with the current SFIS vendor and the September 1999 contract start date as reported in the June 2003 Post Implementation Evaluation Report.



## Statewide Fingerprint Imaging System (SFIS) Project

### FUNDING:

The M & O automation project costs are funded with State General Fund (GF) for the CalWORKs and Food Stamps programs and county share for General Assistance/General Relief costs. Project-related Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF)/Maintenance of Effort (MOE) funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The Current Year and Budget Year (BY) decrease reflects a technical adjustment.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The BY increase reflects adjustments for a pro-rata increase and retirement contributions.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$7,938	\$7,983
Federal	0	0
State	7,678	7,721
County	260	262
Reimbursements	0	0

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$7,938	\$7,983
CDSS	3,805	3,805
OSI	4,133	4,178

## **Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Project Maintenance and Operations (M&O)**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs associated with ongoing M&O for the EBT Project. The EBT system is the automated delivery, redemption, and reconciliation of the Food Stamp Program (FSP) and cash program benefits. It provides program recipients electronic access to food stamp and cash benefits through the use of EBT cards at point-of-sale devices and automated teller machines. The EBT system replaced the paper-based food coupon and, when selected by the counties, cash benefit issuance methods employed in the state for the distribution of the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) program benefits.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 1997-98.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare & Institutions Code (W&IC) section 10069.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Implementation costs, the county rollout schedule, and ongoing operations costs are detailed in the April 2001 Implementation Advance Planning Document, the July 2002 Implementation Advance Planning Document Update (IAPDU), the July 2003 IAPDU, and the November 2004 IAPDU.

### **FUNDING:**

EBT funding comes from the FSP and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program. Federal funds and State General Fund are provided for the FSP. The TANF Program block grant is the funding source for TANF-eligible costs. Based on the cost allocation plan for the project, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program is 100 percent TANF-eligible. Project-related TANF funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The Current Year and Budget Year (BY) decrease reflects a technical adjustment.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The BY increase reflects baseline adjustments for a pro-rata increase and retirement contributions.

## Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Project Maintenance and Operations (M&O)

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$48,437	\$48,547
Federal	32,617	32,692
State	9,676	9,695
County	6,144	6,160

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$48,437	\$48,547
CDSS	169	169
OSI	48,268	48,378

## **Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Project Reprocurement**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

The EBT system is the automated delivery, redemption, and reconciliation of the Food Stamp Program (FSP) and cash program benefits. It provides program recipients electronic access to food stamp and cash benefits through the use of EBT cards at point-of-sale devices and automated teller machines. The EBT system replaced the paper-based food coupon and, when selected by the counties, cash benefit issuance methods employed in the state for the distribution of the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) program benefits.

The existing contract for EBT services is for seven years (expiring on August 8, 2008) with a cost not to exceed \$278,700,000. There are two one-year extensions possible if a new contract is not executed in time. The contract extensions would be a costly alternative as the state currently pays a premium for its EBT services. Furthermore, the current EBT Prime Contractor's existing contract stipulates that if California extends the term of the contract beyond its initial seven-year term, the rates for many of the maintenance and operations activities would be adjusted to reflect the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index for each of the additional one-year periods.

A high priority for this reprocurement is a cost-effective solution for California that will not impact the clients. Based on preliminary analysis of other states' EBT programs, it appears that even though there are differences in service levels, California is at the high end of the price scale (perhaps the highest in the nation). Because of its decentralized county-based welfare infrastructure, California's needs are significantly greater than other states'. However, in today's economy a price reduction per household per month is an achievable goal.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 10069.
- Reprocurement activities will take at least three years to complete.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The EBT Reprocurement Project's planning-phase costs are detailed in the May 2005 EBT Reprocurement Planning Advance Planning Document.

## Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) Project Reprocurement

### FUNDING:

EBT funding comes from the FSP and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program. Federal funds and State General Fund are provided for the FSP. The TANF Program block grant is the funding source for TANF-eligible costs. Based on the cost allocation plan for the project, the federal share of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program is 100 percent TANF-eligible. Project-related TANF funds are identified in total within the "Additional TANF/MOE Expenditures in CDSS" section in the TANF section of each Detail Table.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year increase reflects the addition of an Independent Validation & Verification vendor.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$738	\$863
Federal	497	581
State	241	282
County	0	0

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$738	\$863
CDSS	15	140
OSI	723	723

## **Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs incurred by County Welfare Departments (CWDs) in the administration of each component of the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Program as established through the Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 16500. W&IC section 11461(e)(4)(B) provides additional funding to counties as incentives and assistance specifically for the Aid to Families with Dependent Children/Foster Care Specialized Care Program. These funds will be used to cover the purchase of nonrecurring items on an as needed basis, the purchase of services not available through other fund sources, and the development of a respite care program or purchase of respite care services.

In recognition of the funding and staffing need identified by the workload study authorized by Senate Bill (SB) 2030 (Chapter 785, Statutes of 1998), the estimate reflects funding to allow counties to maintain the level of social workers funded in the prior year.

### **Emergency Response (ER) Component**

ER services consist of a response system providing in-person response, when required, to reports of child abuse, neglect, or exploitation for the purpose of investigation and to determine the necessity for providing initial intake services and crisis intervention to maintain the child safely in his or her own home or to protect the safety of the child.

### **Emergency Response Assessment (ERA) Component**

ERA is the initial intake service provided in response to reported allegations of child abuse, neglect or exploitation that is determined, based upon an evaluation of risk, to be inappropriate for an in-person investigation.

### **Family Maintenance (FM) Component**

FM is designed to provide time-limited protective services to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse or exploitation for the purpose of preventing separation of children from their families. CWDs are responsible for determining the specific service needs of the child and family aimed at sustaining the child in the home.

### **Family Reunification (FR) Component**

FR is designed to provide time-limited services while the child is in temporary foster care to prevent or remedy neglect, abuse or exploitation when the child cannot safely remain at home. CWDs are responsible for determining the specific service needs of the child and/or family aimed at reunifying the child with the family.

### **Permanent Placement (PP) Component**

PP is designed to provide an alternative permanent family structure for children who because of abuse, neglect or exploitation cannot safely remain at home and who are unlikely to ever return home. The CWDs are responsible for determining the appropriate permanent goal for the child and facilitating the implementation of that goal. These goals are defined as guardianship, adoption or long-term placement.

---

## Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: W&IC sections 16500 and 11461(e)(4)(B).
- The workload standard was adopted by the California Department of Social Services in conjunction with the County Welfare Directors' Association in 1984. These standards are 15.8 for ER, 35.0 for FM, 27.0 for FR, 54.0 for PP and 320.0 for ER assessments.
- The statewide annual cost of a social worker (SW) (\$129,074) was based on the estimated cost of providing services, to include total staff costs, support costs, and electronic data processing costs, provided in the Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02 proposed county administrative budgets.
- All counties are reporting caseload data on the CWS/Case Management System (CMS). Caseload projections were developed for each individual county using data through April 2005.
- Additional funds are provided in recognition of the funding and staffing need identified by the workload study authorized by SB 2030. Costs are calculated in order to continue each county's SW full-time equivalent (FTE) level funded in the prior year.

### METHODOLOGY:

#### FY 2005-06

- The Current Year (CY) estimate is being held to the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level except for an adjustment that shifts \$24.6 million in federal costs for investigative activities that are ineligible for Title IV-E funding to the Emergency Assistance (EA)-Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program. An additional \$13.2 million in General Fund (GF) costs for these investigative activities will be backfilled with EA-TANF to save GF in the CY. Also, \$6.7 million in county funds are shifted and reflected in the county share of the EA-TANF program.

#### FY 2006-07

- The estimate is derived by applying the workload standards to the individual county caseload projections and expanding for a 7:1 supervisory ratio. Additional FTEs are included in order to continue each county's prior year FTE level.
  - The annual cost of a SW in each county is applied to the total number of FTEs in each county to derive staff costs for each line.
  - Direct costs are projected from FY 2004-05 actual expenditures and statewide average caseload growth from FY 2004-05 to FY 2006-07. Total direct costs, excluding county-operated emergency shelter care, are \$88.5 million for the 58 counties. The projected county-operated emergency shelter care (ESC) costs are \$40.9 million for those counties with county-operated emergency shelters based on actual expenditures from FY 2004-05.
  - Once the total CWS basic costs are derived, costs for the Emergency Assistance (EA) Program are subtracted and are displayed separately under the "EA Program" premise. The EA Program costs are determined based on the FY 2005-06 funding level (less the shift of non-Title IV-E eligible investigative activities) and any caseload growth.
-

---

## Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

### METHODOLOGY (continued):

- In order to reflect an appropriate level of federal spending authority, additional Titles IV-E and XIX funds are added to the estimate.
- \$22.7 million in federal costs for investigative activities that are ineligible for Title IV-E funding is shifted to the EA-TANF program. An additional \$10.6 million in GF costs for these activities will be backfilled with EA-TANF to save GF in the budget year. Also, \$5.9 million in county costs are shifted and reflected in the county share of the EA-TANF program.
- Beginning in FY 2006-07, \$4.1 million GF is being shifted to this premise from the CWS/CMS System Support Staff to comply with federal Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) requirements and are matched with federal Title IV-E funds.

### FUNDING:

#### FY 2006-07

The federal share of costs is a combination of Titles IV-B, IV-E, XIX and XX funds. The Title IV-B funds are limited by the capped federal allocation.

The estimated Title IV-B funds available in local assistance for FY 2006-07 are \$30.5 million. These funds have a 75-percent federal match rate.

The Title IV-E amount reflects the actual experience from FY 2004-05 that 40.9 percent of the expenditures will be eligible for Title IV-E funding. In order to reflect an appropriate level of federal spending authority based on actual expenditures, additional Title IV-E funds are budgeted in the amount of \$65.9 million.

Hold harmless is funded with Title IV-E and is used to prevent the loss of funding for counties who experience caseload declines. The hold harmless funds are estimated to be \$246.5 million (\$101.0 million GF) for FY 2005-06 and \$278.7 million (\$114.1 million GF) for FY 2006-07.

The Title XIX amount for FY 2006-07 is calculated using individual county usage rates based on FY 2004-05 expenditure data which reflect that 4.7 percent of the expenditures will be eligible for Title XIX funding. These costs are reflected as a reimbursement. In order to reflect an appropriate level of federal spending authority based on actual expenditures, additional Title XIX funds are budgeted in the amount of \$4.7 million.

Nonfederal costs are shared at 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

After the GF amount is calculated, federal Title XX funds transferred from the TANF block grant are used in lieu of GF. The amount of Title XX-eligible costs is calculated based on the nonmatching GF portion of FR and PP expenditures. For FY 2006-07, the Title XX-eligible amount is \$46.2 million.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The FY 2005-06 estimate reflects a decrease due to an increase in the shift of non-Title IV-E eligible funds, to the EA-TANF program for investigative activities.



## Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Direct costs, county-operated ESC costs and the nonfederal sharing ratios have decreased based on actual expenditures. The Title XX-eligible costs have decreased resulting in an increase in GF. The amount of the additional federal spending authority has increased. The amount of non-Title IV-E eligible funds shifted to the EA-TANF program has increased. The amount of GF being shifted to EA TANF for the hotline has decreased causing an increase in GF in CWS Basic. A savings adjustment for the KinGAP program is no longer made as the impact is assumed in the CWS Basic caseload trend. Funds have been shifted from the CWS/CMS System Support Staff premise to CWS Basic to comply with federal SACWIS budgeting requirements.

### CASELOAD:

(Average Monthly)

	2005-06	2006-07
Emergency Response	41,337	41,397
Emergency Response Assessment	15,797	16,656
Family Maintenance	25,428	25,404
Family Reunification	23,958	23,823
Permanent Placement	55,628	52,247

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
<b>Total Basic</b>	<b>County Admin.</b>	<b>County Admin.</b>
Total	\$953,850	\$991,285
Federal	433,494	459,253
State	344,059	348,981
County	128,511	130,599
Reimbursements	47,786	52,452

## Child Welfare Services – Basic Costs

### Weighted Costs by Component:

	2005-06		2006-07	
	<u>TOTAL FUNDS</u>	<u>GENERAL FUND</u>	<u>TOTAL FUNDS</u>	<u>GENERAL FUND</u>
Emergency Response	\$472,759	\$196,256	\$475,261	\$192,005
Emergency Response Assessment	10,091	4,087	10,221	4,025
Family Maintenance	125,507	50,833	142,536	56,134
Family Reunification	155,910	42,075	173,268	46,179
Permanent Placement	<u>189,584</u>	<u>50,808</u>	<u>189,999</u>	<u>50,638</u>
	\$953,850	\$344,059	\$991,285	\$348,981

### Reconciliation of Federal Funds:

	2005-06	2006-07
Title IV-B	\$31,136	\$30,476
Title IV-E	355,065	382,531
Title XIX	47,786	52,452
Title XX	<u>47,293</u>	<u>46,246</u>
Total Federal Funding	\$481,280	\$511,705

### Specialized Care:

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$5,045	\$4,918
Federal	0	0
State	5,045	4,918
County	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## **Federal Budget Bill – Loss of Federal Financial Participation (FFP)**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the cost to backfill the loss of federal Title IV-E funds for children placed in hospitals or mental health institutions for longer than 30 days. The Federal Reconciliation Bill (FRB), signed February 8, 2006 (but effective October 1, 2005), limits the claiming of Title IV-E administrative costs when a child is placed in an ineligible facility to the 30 days prior to the child being moved to a Title IV-E eligible facility or home. Prior to the FRB, there was no limit on administrative claiming if the county was providing pre-placement preventive services or preparing for the child to enter foster care.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

The FRB effective date is October 1, 2005.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- FRB S. 1932, signed February 8, 2006.
- There are approximately 280 cases placed in non-foster care facilities over 30 days statewide.
- The children placed in ineligible foster care facilities represent 0.12 percent of the total foster care caseload.
- Current year costs are based on the October 1, 2005 implementation date. Budget year costs are based on a full year of cost.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The total Child Welfare Services Basic social worker salary and benefit expenditures were multiplied by the percent of cases that are placed in ineligible facilities.

### **FUNDING:**

These costs are ineligible for Title IV-E and will be funded with state General Fund and county funds at the 70 percent state, 30 percent county shares.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

This is a new premise.

## Federal Budget Bill – Loss of Federal Financial Participation (FFP)

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a new premise.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

#### Augmentation Funds:

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	-209	-279
State	146	195
County	63	84
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## Augmentation to Child Welfare Services

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide an augmentation to the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Program. These funds shall be expressly targeted for services provided through the Emergency Response, Family Maintenance, Family Reunification (FR) and Permanent Placement (PP) components of CWS, and shall not be used to supplant existing CWS funds. Funds will be available to counties contingent upon individual counties: 1) matching their CWS Basic General Fund (GF) allocation; and, 2) fully utilizing the CWS/Case Management System. There is no county match required for these funds.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise, formerly known as "Emergency Workload Relief," implemented on July 1, 1998.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Assembly Bill (AB) 1656 (Chapter 324, Statutes of 1998) and AB 1740 (Chapter 52, Statutes of 2000).
- AB 1656 authorized \$40.0 million in GF with no county match required.
- AB 1740 authorized an additional \$34.3 million in GF with no county match required.
- The GF Appropriation has been reduced by \$17,150,000 due to lower revenues and other demands on the available GF.

### METHODOLOGY:

AB 1656 and AB 1740 designated the GF amount; however, due to lower revenues and other demands on the available GF, the GF Appropriation has been reduced by \$17,150,000.

### FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent GF. After the GF amount is calculated, federal Title XX funds transferred from the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant are used in lieu of GF. The amount of Title XX-eligible costs is calculated based on the nonmatching GF portion of FR and PP expenditures. For FY 2005-06, the Title XX-eligible amount is \$8.0 million. For FY 2006-07, the Title XX-eligible amount is \$8.1 million.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

For FY 2006-07, the amount of Title XX-eligible costs has increased.

## Augmentation to Child Welfare Services

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The amount of Title XX-eligible costs has increased.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

#### Augmentation Funds:

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$91,440	\$91,440
Federal	42,266	42,348
State	49,174	49,092
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Child Welfare Services/Case Management System – System Support Staff**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the cost for county administrative staff needed to support the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System which was implemented as a result of Senate Bill 370 (Chapter 1294, Statutes of 1989). These staff are needed for the ongoing operations of the system.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

There was a staggered implementation based on individual county start dates beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 1996-97.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.5.
- Staffing is based on a staff-to-workstation ratio of 1:50 for all counties.
- For FY 2005-06, the electronic data processing (EDP) average monthly salaries were based on each county's proposed county administrative budget for FY 2001-02. If a county did not have an EDP salary, the county's administrative salary was used.
- There are 15,509 budgeted users for FY 2005-06. The county-by-county distribution of users is based on actuals.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

#### **FY 2005-06**

Full-time equivalent (FTE) system support staff are calculated by applying the staff-to-workstation ratio to the total number of workstations in each individual county. These FTEs are funded at each county's individual EDP/administrative salary.

#### **FY 2006-07**

The estimate is based on actual expenditures from FY 2004-05.

### **FUNDING:**

For each FY, the federal share is 50 percent from Statewide Automation Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) funds. The nonfederal share is split 70 percent State General Fund and 30 percent county.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The FY 2006-07 increase is due to an increase in updated actual expenditures.



## **Child Welfare Services/Case Management System – System Support Staff**

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The decrease reflects a shift of \$4.1 million General Fund from this premise to the CWS Basic Costs premise to comply with federal SACWIS requirements.

### **EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$25,120	\$13,359
Federal	12,560	6,679
State	8,792	4,676
County	3,768	2,004
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Child Welfare Services – Emergency Assistance Program (TANF & Title IV-E)**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

These premises reflect the costs associated with the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Emergency Assistance (EA) Program funded through federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Title IV-E funds.

In 1993, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) implemented a statewide EA Program under Title IV-A of the Social Security Act for County Welfare Departments which provides funding for emergency shelter care to children determined to be at risk due to abuse, neglect, abandonment, or exploitation.

In 1994, CDSS implemented crisis resolution and emergency response (ER) as the child welfare services components of emergency assistance. Crisis resolution provides services to families aimed at resolving family crises without removing the child from the home or by allowing the child to be returned to the family with the provision of supporting services to ensure child safety. Under EA/ER, funds will be available for emergency response activities such as receiving and assessing referrals, investigating emergency allegations, and gathering and evaluating relevant information.

EA case management is defined as an array of activities directed to a specific child. These activities include, but are not limited to, developing a case or service plan for a child, working with foster or adoptive parents to prepare them to receive a child, case and administrative reviews, case conferences, or permanency planning meetings.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193 eliminated Title IV-A funding for the EA Program but permitted use of TANF dollars for EA funding. Although P.L. 104-193 allowed TANF funding, the Budget Act of 1997 replaced the TANF funding with State General Fund (GF). Based on interpretation of the final TANF regulations, effective October 1, 1999, EA GF expenditures are not countable towards the TANF maintenance of effort requirement, therefore, the GF was replaced with TANF funding. EA case management activities are now funded with Title IV-E funds in order to free-up TANF dollars.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

Emergency Shelter Care - This component implemented on September 1, 1993.

Crisis Resolution - This component implemented on August 1, 1994.

Emergency Response - This component implemented on August 1, 1994.

Case Management - This component implemented on October 1, 1995.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 15204.25.
- There is 0.28 percent projected caseload growth in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07.
- A total of \$40.2 million in FY 2005-06 and \$45.2 million in FY 2006-07, in additional EA TANF funds are being used for CWS Basic investigative activities that the federal government has deemed ineligible for Title IV-E funding.

## **Child Welfare Services – Emergency Assistance Program (TANF & Title IV-E)**

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The FY 2005-06 EA TANF estimate is being held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level with an adjustment to cover additional CWS Basic activities that are no longer eligible for Title IV-E funding. The FY 2006-07 EA TANF estimate is based on the FY 2005-06 estimate, not including the adjustment, and increased by any individual county caseload growth. Additional funds are then added to cover the CWS Basic activities that are no longer eligible for Title IV-E funding.

### **FUNDING:**

EA funding, although eliminated by P.L. 104-193, was used in the TANF block grant calculation and is, therefore, part of the TANF funding schedule.

The sharing ratio for EA eligible shelter care cases under 30 days, emergency response, and crisis resolution is 85 percent TANF and 15 percent county. For shelter care EA eligible cases over 30 days, the ratio is 50 percent TANF and 50 percent county. These funds are reflected in the "Emergency Assistance TANF" line.

Federally eligible EA case management activities are funded 50 percent Title IV-E after the federal foster care discount rate of 75 percent is applied. Nonfederal costs are shared 85 percent GF and 15 percent county. After the GF amount is calculated, federal Title XX funds transferred from the TANF block grant are used in lieu of GF. The amount of Title XX-eligible costs is calculated based on the nonmatching GF portion of FR and PP expenditures. For FY 2005-06, the Title XX-eligible amount is \$6.2 million. For FY 2006-07, the Title XX-eligible amount is \$6.3 million. These funds are reflected in the "Emergency Assistance Title IV-E" line.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The amount of additional EA TANF funds being used for CWS Basic investigative activities has increased based on information provided by the counties.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

In EA TANF, the non-Title IV-E eligible costs from CWS Basic have decreased. The EA Title IV-E estimate has increased due to caseload growth in CWS Basic. In addition, the Title XX-eligible costs in EA Title IV-E have increased.

## Child Welfare Services – Emergency Assistance Program (TANF & Title IV-E)

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07	2005-06	2006-07
	EA TANF		EA Title IV-E	
Total	\$213,119	\$208,171	\$83,881	\$83,908
Federal	176,527	172,321	37,675	37,751
State	0	0	33,624	33,571
County	36,592	35,850	12,582	12,586
Reimbursements	0	0	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## State Family Preservation

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the authorization for the permanent transfer of funds from an incentive/penalty provision program to a program with a sharing ratio of 70 percent State General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county. In accordance with Assembly 2365 (Chapter 71, Statutes of 1992), the counties that have operated a family preservation program for at least three years can participate in the program. Historically, funding was provided through an annual allocation derived from a shift in funds from the GF (and federal share, to the extent permitted under federal law) of the Aid for Family with Dependent Children-Foster Care appropriation. Fifteen counties opted to participate in the program which included an incentive/penalty provision based on increases/decreases in foster care placements. However, the foster care caseloads began to stabilize which resulted in little savings. Therefore, counties were given the option to permanently transfer funding to a 70 percent GF and 30 percent county share limited to not exceed 70 percent of the highest annual amount spent for family preservation.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 1993-94.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16500.5 through 16500.7.
- The state share of funds reflects up to 70 percent of the highest annual amount expended for family preservation services by 15 counties (Alameda, Contra Costa, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Mendocino, Napa, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Diego, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Solano, and Stanislaus).

### METHODOLOGY:

For FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 the amounts are being held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.

### FUNDING:

The federal Title IV-B, nonfederal, and federal Title XIX reimbursement funding levels are based on FY 2001-02 expenditure data.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## State Family Preservation

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$36,649	\$36,649
Federal	4,325	4,325
State	22,136	22,136
County	9,492	9,492
Reimbursements	696	696

## Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF)

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of the federal PSSF grant to provide community-based, family-centered services to focus on supporting and preserving families, protecting children and preventing child abuse and neglect. The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 established this capped grant program under Title IV-B.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1993.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16600 through 16604.5.
- The federal Title IV-B funds cannot be used to supplant existing state or local spending.
- Effective Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02, based on federal requirements, a minimum of 20 percent of PSSF funds must be spent on each of the four components of the program (Family Preservation Services, Family Support Services, Adoption Promotion and Support, and Time-Limited Family Reunification).
- A 25 percent match from state or county funds is required. This match is made available through existing State Family Preservation Program funds.
- For FY 2005-06, this premise includes \$2 million to support an Interagency Agreement with the California Department of Social Services and the Department of Alcohol and Drugs for dependency drug court activities and an evaluation component.
- The Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2005 grant is \$4.4 million less than the FFY 2004 grant. Additional prior year unspent funds were added to cover anticipated costs. It is projected that the FFY 2006 grant will be as much as the FFY 2005 grant.

### METHODOLOGY:

The federal funds for this program are the sum of grants converted from an FFY to a State FY.

For FY 2005-06, a non-add line has been included in the Detail Table to reflect the federal fund costs associated with the reappropriation of \$5.6 million from FY 2004-05 in unspent funds to support Child Welfare Services (CWS) Program Improvement Project activities.

### FUNDING:

This premise reflects federal Title IV-B grant funds to be used over a two-year period.



## Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF)

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The FY 2006-07 amount reflects the projected FFY 2006 federal grant award based on the FFY 2005 grant.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$43,803	\$41,505
Federal	43,803	41,505
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

PSSF	2005-06	2006-07
Reappropriation <sup>1</sup>	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$5,600	\$0
Federal	5,600	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

<sup>1</sup>- This is a non-add item.

## Independent Living Program

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of the federal grant for the Independent Living Program (ILP). The Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 permanently authorized this program, which offers training to foster care adolescents and emancipated youth enabling them to be independent when their foster care terminates. County Welfare Departments provide or arrange for the provision of services that facilitate the transition of foster children to emancipated lifestyles.

Federal statute, H.R.3443, the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP) Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-169), amended Section 477 of the Social Security Act providing more flexibility in funding of ILP services. The CFCIP authorized the expansion of this program to serve foster care youth ages 16 to 21. In addition, counties were given the discretion to provide ILP services to youth ages 14 and 15 when it was determined that these youth would most likely remain in foster care until emancipation. Counties are authorized to use up to 30 percent of their grant to provide housing assistance for emancipated foster youth and aftercare services to former foster youth ages 18 to 21.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1988.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10609.3.
- Funding is based on the federal grant awards for ILP.
- The grant amount for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2004 was \$26,105,639.
- The grant amount for FFY 2005 was \$25,012,729.
- The estimated grant amount for FFY 2006 is \$24,252,387.

### METHODOLOGY:

- For State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2005-06, the federal funding amount is obtained by converting the federal grant from a FFY to a SFY [one quarter of the FFY 2004 grant (\$6,526,410) and three quarters of the FFY 2005 grant (3 x \$6,253,182)], less \$1,019,784 for state operations costs.
- For SFY 2006-07, the federal funding amount is obtained by converting the federal grant from a FFY to a SFY [one quarter of the FFY 2005 grant (\$6,253,182) and three quarters of the FFY 2006 grant (3 x \$6,063,097)], less \$1,019,784 for state operations costs.

### FUNDING:

This premise is funded 100 percent with a federal grant award. The matching funds are provided through the "Extended ILP" premise.

## Independent Living Program

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There was a decrease in the federal grant.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$24,266	\$23,423
Federal	24,266	23,423
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Extended Independent Living Program

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the State General Fund (GF) portion of the Independent Living Program (ILP), which provides training for eligible foster care adolescents aged 16 to 21 years old, enabling them to be independent when their foster care terminates. Senate Bill 933 (Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998) implemented the GF portion to extend ILP services to 100 percent of the eligible foster care adolescent population, up to the age of 21 years. County Welfare Departments provide or arrange for the provision of services that facilitate the transition of foster children to emancipated lifestyles.

In addition, counties are given the discretion to provide ILP services to youth ages 14 and 15, when it is determined that these youth would most likely remain in foster care until emancipated. Counties are authorized to use up to 30 percent of their allocation to provide housing assistance for emancipated foster youth and aftercare service to former foster youth ages 18 to 21.

Effective January 1, 2006, Senate Bill 436 (Chapter 629, Statutes of 2005) requires the County Welfare Department in a county that provides transitional housing placement services to include in its annual ILP report a description of currently available transitional housing resources in relation to the number of emancipating pregnant or parenting foster youth in the county, and a plan for meeting any unmet transitional housing needs of the emancipating pregnant or parenting foster youth.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in September 1998.

Senate Bill 436 (Chapter 629, Statutes of 2005) implemented on January 1, 2006.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 10609.3 and Senate Bill 436 (Chapter 629, Statutes of 2005).
- At least one (1) hour per case to collect and to report available transitional housing resources and to develop a plan for meeting any unmet transitional housing needs of the emancipating pregnant or parenting foster youth.
- The social worker cost per hour is \$72.60.
- For calendar year 2004, the number of female emancipated youths was 2,465.
- In calendar year 2003, the teen parent birth rate for 19 year olds is 76.7 per 1000 women.
- Assembly Bill 436 is a new state mandate; there is no county cost.

## Extended Independent Living Program

### METHODOLOGY:

For Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and FY 2006-07, the funding is held to the Budget Act 2005 appropriation plus additional GF is added based on the approximate number of emancipated pregnant or parenting foster youth multiplied by the one hour of social worker costs.

### FUNDING:

This premise is funded 100 percent GF.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$15,166	\$15,166
Federal	0	0
State	15,166	15,166
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

# Chafee Post Secondary Education & Training Vouchers

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the amount of the federal grant for Chafee Post Secondary Education and Training Vouchers. This funding is provided under the Educational and Training Vouchers (ETV) Program which is part of the Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (CFCIP).

The Foster Care Independence Act of 1999, Public Law 107-133, amended Section 477 of the Social Security Act to provide States with flexible funding to design and conduct education and training voucher programs for youth who age out of foster care. This can assist youth with the development of skills necessary to lead independent and productive lives. The purpose of this program is to make available vouchers of up to \$5,000 per year per youth for education and training, including post secondary training and education, to eligible youth who have aged out of foster care.

Individuals eligible to receive vouchers under this program are: (1) youth otherwise eligible for services under the State CFCIP program; (2) youth adopted from foster care after attaining age 16; (3) youth participating in the voucher program on their 21<sup>st</sup> birthday, until they turn 23 years old, as long as they are enrolled in a post secondary education or training program and are making satisfactory progress toward completion of that program.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 2003.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Foster Care Independence Act of 1999, Public Law 107-133, Section 477 of the Social Security Act, as amended.
- Funding is based on the federal grant awards for ETV.
- The grant amount for Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2005 is \$8,547,517. The estimated grant for FFY 2006 that California will receive is \$8,371,537.
- A 20 percent match of the total cost is required. The match may be cash or in-kind contributions.
- Future funding will be appropriated on an annual basis pending congressional authorization.

## METHODOLOGY:

This premise reflects federal grant funds to be used for State Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 through September 30, 2006, and for FY 2006-07 through September 30, 2007.

## Chafee Post Secondary Education & Training Vouchers

### FUNDING:

This premise is funded 100 percent with a federal grant award. The matching funds are provided through the "Emancipated Youth Stipend" premise.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is an anticipated decrease in the FFY 2006 federal grant.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$8,548	\$8,372
Federal	8,548	8,372
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Transitional Housing for Foster Youth (AB 427)

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the one-time funding for the Transitional Housing for Foster Youth Fund, which is available until it is fully expended. It also reflects the federal and county match of this one-time funding. This premise initially changed the Transitional Housing Placement Program (THPP) by expanding the age range for participation from 17 to 18 years of age to 16 to 21 years of age. It also enabled additional counties to participate in the THPP and Transitional Housing Program Plus (THP-Plus) by providing a new rate-setting methodology.

The federal and county funds in this premise reflect new monies available to the Program in the current year. The State General Fund (GF) is a carryover from the initial THPP appropriation, and therefore shows as a "non-add" line in the Detail Tables.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2002.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Health and Safety Code Section 1559.110 and Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 11400, 16522 and 16522.1
- The nonfederal sharing ratio is 40 percent state and 60 percent county.
- Funding for the Transitional Housing for Foster Youth Fund will be available until fully expended.

### METHODOLOGY:

It is assumed that the balance of the Transitional Housing Fund will be fully expended in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06. As stated above, the GF shows as a "non-add" line in the Detail Tables.

### FUNDING:

Federal funding is provided by Title IV-E of the Social Security Act, with the amount of federal financial participation based on the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage rate, for those cases meeting federal eligibility criteria.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The decrease reflects less available balance in the Transitional Housing Fund.



## Transitional Housing for Foster Youth (AB 427)

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

It is anticipated that the funds will be fully expended in FY 2005-06. In FY 2006-07, \$1.4 million GF will be added to the Transitional Housing for Foster Youth (AB 1119) premise.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

#### ITEM 151 –

Child Welfare Services	2005-06	2006-07
	County Services	County Services
Total	\$1,765	\$0
Federal	1,103	0
State	0	0
County	662	0
Reimbursements	0	0

#### ITEM 151 –

Child Welfare Services <sup>1</sup>	2005-06	2006-07
	County Services	County Services
Total	\$439	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	439	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

<sup>1</sup> – This is a non-add item.

## **Transitional Housing for Foster Youth AB 1119 and AB 824**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise changes the Transitional Housing Program Plus (THP-Plus) for youth 18 to 21 years of age by eliminating the requirement that youth receive aid pursuant to the Assembly Bill (AB) 427 (Chapter 125, Statutes of 2001) Supportive Transitional Emancipation Program (STEP) in order to be eligible for transitional housing placement services. AB 1119 also enables counties that have not elected to participate in STEP to participate in THP-Plus utilizing the new rate-setting methodology (70 percent) for the average group home rate as established by AB 427.

Effective January 1, 2006, AB 824 (Chapter 636, Statutes of 2005) raises the age limit for receipt of THPP services by an emancipated foster youth to 24 years of age.

Beginning in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07, the special fund set up for AB 427 will be fully expended. Therefore, the AB 427 premise will be discontinued. All funds for the Transitional Housing for Youths will be covered under this premise.

In FY 2005-06, this premise reflects the state and county costs associated with the THP-Plus placements. Beginning FY 2006-07, the premise will include the federal, state, and county costs associated with the Transitional Housing Placement Program (THPP) and THP-Plus. The federal Title IV-E funding is available for youth ages 16 to 18. Youths ages 18 to 24 are ineligible for federal funds.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

AB 427 implemented on January 1, 2002.

AB1119 implemented on January 1, 2003.

AB 824 (Chapter 636, Statutes of 2005) implementation date is January 1, 2006.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Health and Safety Code 1559.110 and Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 11400, 11403.2, 11403.3., 16522 and 16522.1.
- Costs are shared 40 percent state and 60 percent county.
- The THP-Plus rate is 70 percent of the county's group home average grant.
- There are 28 counties participating in THPP with 3 applications pending and 10 counties participating in THP-Plus with 4 applications pending.
- There is no appropriation tied to the implementation of AB 824.

## Transitional Housing for Foster Youth AB 1119 and AB 824

### METHODOLOGY:

Funding for FY 2005-06 is being held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level. Also, in FY 2005-06, Item 153 Transitional Housing for Foster Youth will be reflected under Item 151 Child Welfare Services Transitional Housing.

### FUNDING:

Funding is shared 40 percent state and 60 percent county.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

In FY 2006-07, the THPP (AB 427) special fund will be fully expended. Therefore, the increase reflects the additional State General Fund and federal funds to support the projected increase in caseload for both the THPP and the THP-Plus as identified in local county plans.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

#### ITEM 151 –

Child Welfare Services	2005-06	2006-07
	County Services	County Services
Total	\$3,420	\$8,170
Federal	0	1,230
State	1,368	2,776
County	2,052	4,164
Reimbursements	0	0

## Emancipated Foster Youth Stipends

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs to provide special needs stipends for emancipating foster youth. The program can assist emancipating foster youth with finding affordable housing, text books for college or vocational training, employment searches, emergency personal needs, and bus vouchers. County welfare departments will provide for the provision of these services. A portion of this amount is being used as match for the Chafee Post Secondary Education and Training Vouchers.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2000.

### METHODOLOGY:

The Budget Bill designates State General Fund (GF) support levels.

### FUNDING:

This program is funded 100 percent GF.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Services	County Services
Total	\$3,602	\$3,602
Federal	0	0
State	3,602	3,602
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Recruitment and Retention of Social Workers

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to fund a contract with Cooperative Personnel Services/Merit System Services to help recruit and retain social workers in 30 small counties. Due to the continued difficulties of hiring and retaining social workers, Merit System Services will work with counties to implement and provide on-going recruitment efforts and career development plans to increase and retain the number of social workers in the smaller counties.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2001.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The recruitment and career development plans were designed during Fiscal Year (FY) 2000-01.

### METHODOLOGY:

The funding for this premise reflects the amount of the contract with Merit System Services.

### FUNDING:

This premise is eligible for federal Title IV-E funding. After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent for FY 2005-06 and for FY 2006-07 is applied, costs are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent State General Fund (GF). Nonfederally-eligible costs are funded with 100 percent GF.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$269	\$269
Federal	101	101
State	168	168
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Child Welfare Training Program

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for providing a statewide coordinated training program designed specifically to meet the needs of county child protective services social workers assigned to emergency response, family maintenance, family reunification, permanent placement, and adoptions responsibilities. The training program was established by Senate Bill (SB) 834 (Chapter 1310, Statutes of 1987), and extended permanently by SB 1125 (Chapter 1203, Statutes of 1991).

The Child Welfare Training Program includes training for other agencies under contract with County Welfare Departments to provide child welfare case management services. The program also includes crisis intervention, investigative techniques, rules of evidence, indicators of abuse and neglect, assessment criteria, intervention strategies, family-based services, legal requirements of child protection, case management, and the use of community resources.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1988.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16200 through 16215.
- The implementation of regional training academies started in 1996.
- Funding is based on contract amounts entered into by the California Department of Social Services.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimates for both Fiscal Years (FYs) 2005-06 and 2006-07 are based on contract costs.

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent is applied for FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07, federally-eligible costs are shared at 75 percent federal and 25 percent state, with the exception of various contracts which will use federal Title IV-E funds with an in-kind match. Nonfederally eligible costs are funded with 100 percent State General Fund (GF).

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

For FY 2005-06, the contracted costs have been updated.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The GF increase is due to a federal review of the child welfare services university contracts that found costs ineligible for the enhanced 75 percent Title IV-E training reimbursement rate. The costs are eligible for the Title IV-E funding at the 50 percent administrative reimbursement rate.



## Child Welfare Training Program

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$13,805	\$15,619
Federal	9,335	9,225
State	4,470	6,394
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the recruitment, special training, and respite care for specially recruited and trained foster family providers caring for children with medical problems related to drug or alcohol exposure or to Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS). Originally established as a demonstration project by Senate Bill (SB) 1173 (Chapter 1385, Statutes of 1989) and Assembly Bill (AB) 2268 (Chapter 1437, Statutes of 1989), the program was extended by SB 1050 (Chapter 296, Statutes of 1993) and made into a permanent program in 1997 by AB 67 (Chapter 606, Statutes of 1997). AB 2037 (Chapter 799, Statutes of 2000) revised the age for children participating in this program from age three to age five for those counties that have participated in the program for at least three years.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1989.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 16525.10 through 16525.30.
- The savings to the Foster Care Program resulting from diverting children from expensive out-of-home placements are reflected in the caseload and expenditure trends for foster care.
- This program is available to any county requesting participation pursuant to established procedures and to the extent funds are available. Currently, there are 10 counties that are participating in this program (Alameda, Butte, Contra Costa, Glenn, Monterey, San Diego, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, Santa Cruz, and Shasta).

### METHODOLOGY:

Effective Fiscal Year 2005-06, Orange County has elected to opt out of implementing this program. Orange County's allocated amount is subtracted from the total funds. The foster care federal discount rate was applied to the training and recruitment components.

### FUNDING:

Respite care is funded 70 percent State General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county funds. The training and recruitment components are funded with 75 percent and 50 percent federal funds, respectively, after the foster care federal discount rate is applied. The nonfederal portion is funded 70 percent GF and 30 percent county funds.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

## Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$5,649	\$5,649
Federal	1,744	1,744
State	2,733	2,733
County	1,172	1,172
Reimbursements	0	0

## Child Welfare Services – Pass-Through Title IV-E Costs

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the pass-through of federal Title IV-E funds for probation and other public agency administrative costs, foster parent training, and social work training as described below.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

Probation Costs	June 1991
Social Work Training	1992-1993
Other Public Agencies	2003-2004
Social Worker/County Counsel Training	2005-2006
Foster and Kinship Care Education Program* (Community College Chancellor's Office)	2005-2006

\*Incorporates the Foster Parent Training Fund (1990-1991) and the Foster Parent Training (1998-1999)

### METHODOLOGY:

This premise includes the combined estimated expenditures for the following four Title IV-E pass-through costs:

- **Probation Costs** - The State received federal approval to pass on Title IV-E administration funds for county probation staff activities that are similar to the Title IV-E eligible tasks of county social services workers. This federal funding source will be passed through to the county probation departments for their federally-eligible activities related to probation supervised cases in foster care and the Title IV-E eligible training of probation staff who complete case management activities on behalf of these children.
- **Other Public Agencies** – The federal government allows Title IV-E reimbursement for administrative activities associated with pre-placement prevention. Under current California Department of Social Services (CDSS) regulations and specified conditions, counties may pass on Title IV-E funds to other county public agencies, such as Education or Mental Health, who perform eligible administrative activities for children at risk of, or currently placed in foster care. This pass-on provision does not apply to similar activities performed by private non-profit organizations.
- **Foster and Kinship Care Education Program (Community College Chancellor's Office)** – Beginning Fiscal Year 2005-06, the Foster Parent Training Fund is being incorporated into the Community College Proposition 98 fund. Title IV-E funds will be accessed by using the Community College Proposition 98 funds as match for the purpose of reimbursing the California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office for providing education and training to foster parents and kinship care providers. This program is conducted through community colleges in consultation with CDSS and key state foster and caregiver associations. Statutes that relate to the type of education and training this program delivers includes: Senate Bill 2003

## Child Welfare Services – Pass-Through Title IV-E Costs

### METHODOLOGY (continued):

(Chapter 1597, Statutes of 1984); Assembly Bill (AB) 3062 (Chapter 1016, Statutes of 1996); AB 2307 (Chapter 745, Statutes of 2000); and AB 458 (Chapter 331, Statutes of 2003).

- **Social Worker Training** - An agreement between CDSS, the University of California and the California State University was implemented for a statewide training program to increase the number of social workers employed in California county welfare departments. This effort was initiated due to the shortage of professionals in public child welfare services, especially those holding a master's degree in social work.

Currently, there are 17 schools of social work participating. Funding is provided with Title IV-E federal funds and using in kind match provided by the state universities.

- **Social Worker/County Counsel Training**– The trainings will be coordinated and overseen by the Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) through a contract with statewide and local training providers to provide short-term training to enhance social worker and county counsel's understanding of the judicial determination process and necessary court findings on behalf of children in foster care.

### FUNDING:

Costs represent 100 percent federal Title IV-E funds and no state share of costs.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

FY 2006-07 reflects an increase in social worker training costs by initiating a Bachelor of Social Work stipend pilot.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

<b>COMBINED TOTAL:</b>	2005-06 County Admin.	2006-07 County Admin.
Total	\$213,071	\$213,466
Federal	213,071	\$213,466
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Child Welfare Services – Pass-Through Title IV-E Costs

### DETAILED TOTALS:

<b>Probation:</b>	2005-06 County Admin.	2006-07 County Admin.	<b>Other Public Agencies:</b>	2005-06 County Admin.	2006-07 County Admin.
Total	\$176,545	\$176,545	Total	\$2,915	\$2,915
Federal	176,545	\$176,545	Federal	2,915	2,915
State	0	0	State	0	0
County	0	0	County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0	Reimbursements	0	0

<b>Foster and Kinship Care Education Program</b>	2005-06 County Admin.	2006-07 County Admin.	<b>Social Worker Training</b>	2005-06 County Admin.	2006-07 County Admin.
Total	\$6,112	\$6,112	Total	\$27,113	\$27,508
Federal	6,112	6,112	Federal	27,113	\$27,508
State	0	0	State	0	0
County	0	0	County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0	Reimbursements	0	0

<b>AOC Social Worker/County Counsel Training:</b>	2005-06 County Admin.	2006-07 County Admin.
Total	\$386	\$386
Federal	386	386
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## **Foster Parent Training and Recruitment**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs for the enhanced statewide foster parent training and recruitment program. As part of the Foster Care Initiative, Assembly Bill 2129 (Chapter 1089, Statutes of 1993), the California Department of Social Services was required to develop and implement an expanded foster parent training program, and to provide specialized training for foster parents of children with special care needs. Expansion of recruitment activities for minority and sibling placements is also specifically emphasized.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on January 1, 1994.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 903.8.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Total funding for the current year is being held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level. Budget year includes costs for program expansion.

### **FUNDING:**

This program is eligible for Title IV-E federal funding. After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and for FY 2006-07 is applied, costs are shared 75 percent federal and 25 percent nonfederal for the training costs, and 50 percent federal and 50 percent nonfederal for the recruitment costs. The nonfederal shares are funded 100 percent with State General Fund. The funds are evenly distributed for each component of the program.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

This premise reflects an increase in budget year for program expansion.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

There is additional funding needed to increase contract costs to add additional Spanish speaking workers.



## Foster Parent Training and Recruitment

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$3,598	\$3,648
Federal	1,687	1,710
State	1,911	1,938
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Minor Parent Services and Investigations

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for a program designed to discourage teen pregnancy and encourage appropriate parenting of teen parents and their children. As established by Assembly Bill 908 (Chapter 304, Statutes of 1995), the guidelines require pregnant and parenting teens to live with their parents or legal guardians as a condition for receiving welfare benefits unless specific conditions exist. Teen parents not living at home will live in an appropriate, supervised setting. Minor Parent Services (MPS) will be provided if deemed necessary.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The investigative part of this premise implemented on May 1, 1997.

The MPS part of this premise implemented on June 1, 1997.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) sections 11254, 16504(b), and 16506.
- It is assumed that any situations of abuse or neglect under W&IC Section 300 requiring a foster care living arrangement resulting from this investigation are already reflected in Child Welfare Services (CWS) and Foster Care caseload trends.
- It is assumed that a social worker will spend four hours investigating each case. The four hours include one and one-half hours each for two client contacts (teen parent and the teen parent's parent(s) or legal guardian), including interviews and documentation. An additional hour is allocated for travel and time to prepare a report of the social worker's findings.
- Based on historical family maintenance data, it is assumed that minor parents (mostly those at 17 years of age) will be allowed to form their own assistance units (AUs) and receive MPS. The estimated number of minor parents approved for their own AUs at age 17 is based on application survey data. An average of six months of services is estimated for each case.

### METHODOLOGY:

The total funding for both Fiscal Years (FYs) 2005-06 and 2006-07 is being held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.

### FUNDING:

The costs of performing the investigations and providing MPS are eligible for 50 percent funding under the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families block grant. All nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent state and 30 percent county.

## Minor Parent Services and Investigations

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change in the combined total; however, based on actual expenditures, the investigations and minor parent services costs are updated.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

<b>COMBINED TOTAL:</b>	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$7,097	\$7,097
Federal	3,549	3,549
State	2,484	2,484
County	1,064	1,064
Reimbursements	0	0

<b>Investigations:</b>	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$3,096	\$3,096
Federal	1,548	1,548
State	1,084	1,084
County	464	464
Reimbursements	0	0

<b>Minor Parent Services:</b>	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$4,001	\$4,001
Federal	2,001	2,001
State	1,400	1,400
County	600	600
Reimbursements	0	0

## Dependency Drug Court

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects funding to continue support of the Dependency Drug Court Program via an Interagency Agreement with the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) and the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (DADP) for the county drug court pilots and continuation of the cost benefit evaluation. Dependency Drug Courts play a critical role in monitoring families who are involved with the child welfare system because of child abuse or neglect by overseeing compliance with the law, adjudicating cases, and ensuring permanency, safety and well being of children. Drug courts have been established for the past 10 years to provide a therapeutic alternative to incarceration for individuals in the criminal justice system with drug problems. The blending of these two approaches, dependency court and drug court, has resulted in the recent emergence of "Dependency Drug Courts" which combine the two functions of: (1) monitoring families in the child welfare system regarding child protection and permanent placement and (2) providing therapeutic interventions for individuals with substance abuse problems under court monitoring.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented January 1, 2005.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 11970.1 through 11970.4.
- Nine counties have agreed to pilot either a new or expanded Dependency Drug Court Program.
- CDSS funding will augment the amount DADP currently funds for the pilot programs.
- For FY 2006-07, \$1.8 million will be used to fund drug court activities and \$300,000 will be used to continue the cost benefit evaluation.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimate for FY 2006-07 is based on contract costs.

### FUNDING:

Unspent Promoting Safe and Stable Families (PSSF) funds were used to fund the Dependency Drug Court Program from FY 2004-05 to FY 2005-06 under the PSSF premise. PSSF funds are no longer available to continue funding for the drug courts. Therefore, state General Fund (GF) will be used to fund the drug courts in FY 2006-07.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

No funds were budgeted to continue support of the Dependency Drug Court Program pending the outcome of the cost benefit evaluation.

## Dependency Drug Court

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

More data was needed in order to determine the cost benefit of the Dependency Drug Court. Therefore, the decision was made to continue support for the drug court pilot and to continue the cost benefit evaluation. Due to PSSF funds no longer being available, the funding has shifted from PSSF to GF, and the evaluation costs have increased.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$2,000	\$2,100
Federal	\$2,000	0
State	0	\$2,100
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Kinship Support Services

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the grants-in-aid program that provides start-up and expansion funds for local kinship support service programs. As designated by Assembly Bill (AB) 1193 (Chapter 794, Statutes of 1997), the Kinship Support Services Program (KSSP) is to be conducted by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) with the initial grants being awarded in July 1998 to eight counties. Currently, there are 11 counties participating in the program. These programs are to provide community-based family support services to kinship (relative) caregivers and the children who are placed in their homes by the juvenile court or who are at risk of dependency or delinquency.

Effective Fiscal Year 2006-07, the KSSP will be augmented by \$2.5 million and all counties will be allowed to apply for the KSSP funds. The application process will require each interested county to submit a comprehensive proposal outlining how many relative caretakers reside in their county, what services will be provided to relative caretakers and the children in their care, how the county will develop the necessary community supports, how many relative caretakers and children will be served, and what the county outcome improvement goals are for the program. The proposals must also include a description of how each county will measure the success and cost-effectiveness of their program, and how the county will report these measures to the CDSS.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1998.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutes Code Section 16605.
- The participating counties for Fiscal Years (FY) 2005-06 and 2006-07 are: Alameda, Contra Costa, Los Angeles, Monterey, Riverside, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Stanislaus.
- Beginning FY 2006-07, it is anticipated that additional counties will participate in the KSSP.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimate reflects the amount contained in AB 1193 and the 2006 Budget Act.

### FUNDING:

This premise is funded 100 percent with State General Fund (GF).

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase reflects the expansion of the existing KSSP and funding to additional counties statewide.

## Kinship Support Services

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,500	\$4,000
Federal	0	0
State	1,500	4,000
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Kinship/Foster Care Emergency Funds

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to provide emergency funds to relative caregivers and foster parents. The program primarily offers one-time assistance for necessary housing needs, such as extra beds and clothing. Short-term support services, such as crisis counseling, are also provided to prevent children from entering or re-entering the child welfare system.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2000.

### METHODOLOGY:

The California Department of Social Services received policy clarification from the federal Department of Health and Human Services that administrative costs for beds, cribs, and smoke detectors that are needed in order to license or approve a foster family home are allowable under Title IV-E. Effective Fiscal Year 2005-06, the total \$1 million is being applied to draw down the federal reimbursement.

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent is applied, costs are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent nonfederal. The nonfederal shares are funded 100 percent State General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.



## Kinship/Foster Care Emergency Funds

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,600	\$1,600
Federal	600	600
State	1,000	1,000
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Child Welfare Services/Case Management System Staff Development

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to fund staff development for the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) which was implemented as a result of Senate Bill 370 (Chapter 1294, Statutes of 1989). The estimate includes costs for five training components plus costs to maintain three training tools in order to continue to provide a statewide CWS/CMS training curriculum and classes. This statewide training promotes user continuity and consistency to meet Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System requirements.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 16501.5.
- The estimate includes training costs for all new users as a result of user growth and staff turnover.
- The cost per hour of training is \$48.07 for each fiscal year.
- The estimate assumes an 11.5 percent staff turnover rate.
- There are 15,819 budgeted users for each fiscal year.
- The estimate includes costs for five training components:
  - ◆ **New User Training** – provides 44 hours of basic training for newly hired staff as a result of staff turnover;
  - ◆ **Intermediate/Advanced Training** – provides 16 hours of training to service providers on the more difficult tasks not covered in the new user training;
  - ◆ **Management/Supervisory Training** – provides 16 hours of training to management on the supervisory process of approvals and program management reports;
  - ◆ **System Support Training** – provides 24 hours of training to newly hired system support staff as a result of caseload growth and staff turnover in order to assist other users as needed; and,
  - ◆ **Database Training** – provides 24 hours of training to staff responsible for extracting and interpreting caseload data.
- Costs are also included for statewide contracted training needs.

## Child Welfare Services/Case Management System Staff Development

### METHODOLOGY:

Costs are calculated for each training component by multiplying the number of users being trained by the number of hours of training at the hourly cost for training. Costs are then added for the statewide contracted training needs.

**Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and FY 2006-07:** (1,819 New Users x 44 hours x \$48.07) + (1,559 Intermediate/Advanced Users x 16 hours x \$48.07) + (195 Management/Supervisory Users x 16 hours x \$48.07) + (55 System Support Users x 24 hours x \$48.07) + (29 Database Users x 24 hours x \$48.07). For the statewide contract costs, \$3,148,991 is added in FY 2005-06 and \$3,000,000 is added in FY 2006-07 in order to meet the total contract commitment.

### FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent, federally-eligible costs are shared 75 percent federal Title IV-E and 25 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent State General Fund (GF) and 30 percent county. However, nonfederal costs for the statewide training contract are 100 percent GF.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The statewide training contract costs have decreased.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$8,443	\$8,294
Federal	4,749	4,665
State	2,999	2,934
County	695	695
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## **CWS/CMS Maintenance and Operations (M&O) Project**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs related to the ongoing and administrative support of the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS). As mandated by Senate Bill 370 (Chapter 1294, Statutes of 1989), the CWS/CMS provides a comprehensive database, case management tool, and reporting system for the CWS Program. It contains both current and historical information for all children statewide in emergency response, family maintenance, family reunification, and permanent placement. CWS/CMS also includes information regarding adoptions to produce the semiannual Adoption and Foster Care Analysis Reporting System (AFCARS) reports.

CWS/CMS provides: (1) immediate statewide data on referrals for children at risk of abuse, neglect or exploitation; (2) immediate case status and case tracking for children and families receiving child welfare services; (3) necessary information and forms required to determine eligibility for the Aid to Families with Dependent Children - Foster Care Program; (4) tracking for all placement activities for children in foster care; and (5) issuance of the appropriate notice of action messages, court reports and service plans. The system also produces all required state and federal reports.

State level project management for CWS/CMS is provided by the Office of Systems Integration (OSI). OSI is administering the projects under an interagency agreement with the California Department of Social Services (CDSS).

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise became effective Fiscal Year (FY) 1995-96.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.5.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Costs are based on the January 2006 CWS/CMS Maintenance and Operations Plan.

### **FUNDING:**

The cost allocation reflects a Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) methodology. Federal funding is based on the federal cost allocation plan for CWS/CMS. Federally eligible costs are shared at 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent state General Fund. This change is in accordance with the Administration for Children and Families (ACF) direction as provided in their letter dated October 12, 2004.

## CWS/CMS Maintenance and Operation (M&O) Project

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year decrease is due to a one-time reduction in consultant services and a technical adjustment. The budget year net decrease is due to reductions in prime vendor and one-time contracts and a technical adjustment, partially offset by an increase for disaster recovery services.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year increase reflects the following changes: a return of redirected funding from the Go Forward Plan, a decrease of the prime vendor contract, a decrease of one-time contracts, and additional resources needed for disaster recovery services.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$65,483	\$86,989
Federal	32,690	43,432
State	32,546	43,244
County	0	0
Reimbursements	247	313

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$65,483	\$86,989
CDSS	6,828	32,745
OSI	58,655	54,244

## **CWS/CMS Go Forward Plan Project**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs related to the implementation of the Go Forward Plan (GFP) Project. The Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) Go Forward Plan and As Needed Advance Planning Document Update (APDU) were sent to the federal Administration for Children and Families (ACF) on August 13, 2004. On October 12, 2004, the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) received a letter from the ACF confirming the negotiated strategies listed in the APDU. The ACF has conditionally approved the Go Forward APDU and the State's request for the restoration and resumption of the federally defined Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS)-level funding for CWS/CMS. The State may claim CWS/CMS related operational costs identified in the APDU's budget at the SACWIS level through December 2005. In order to retain this level of funding for past and future CWS/CMS related expenses, the State must pursue a direction with CWS/CMS or other statewide automation that is acceptable to ACF.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise was implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.5.
- \$617,000 was redirected to the New System Project in FY 2006-07.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Costs are based on the August 2004 Go Forward Plan (GFP) As Needed APDU and subsequent baseline adjustments.

### **FUNDING:**

The cost allocation reflects a SACWIS methodology. Federal funding is based on the federal cost allocation plan for CWS/CMS. Federally eligible costs are shared at 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent state. This change is in accordance with ACF direction as provided in their letter dated October 12, 2004.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

The current year decrease is due to reductions in contract services. The budget year decrease is due to redirections from GFP to the New System.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The budget year decrease reflects: a return of redirected funding from the GFP back to Maintenance and Operations, and a redirection of funding from GFP to the New System.

## CWS/CMS Go Forward Plan Project

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$50,897	\$5,998
Federal	25,418	2,985
State	25,479	3,013
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$50,897	\$5,998
CDSS	23,333	5,605
OSI	27,564	393

## **CWS/CMS Application Server Replacement Project**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs related to the replacement of server hardware, operating system, and support software to enable the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) to continue to function with a viable, technologically current infrastructure that supports the CWS Program.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise was implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 2001-02.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.5.
- Costs are based on the FY 2002-03 Budget Change Proposal.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Costs represent services to design, develop, configure, test, pilot, and implement the new server solution and the purchase of server hardware and software.

### **FUNDING:**

The cost allocation reflects a Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) methodology. Federal funding is based on the federal cost allocation plan for CWS/CMS. Federally eligible costs are shared at 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent state. This change is in accordance with ACF direction as provided in their letter dated October 12, 2004.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The budget year decrease reflects the discontinuance of this premise in FY 2006-07.



## CWS/CMS Application Server Replacement Project

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$276	\$0
Federal	138	0
State	138	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$276	\$0
CDSS	0	0
OSI	276	0

## **CWS/CMS New System Project**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs related to the planning of the New System Project. On April 1, 2005, a Technical Architecture Alternatives Analysis was submitted to the federal Administration for Children and Families (ACF) and the Legislature. The state received a letter from the ACF on May 16, 2005 in support of the report's recommendations. The New System will be developed using a web services-based technical architecture and include the re-development of existing functionality and development of the four unfulfilled Statewide Automated Child Welfare Information System (SACWIS) requirements on the new architecture. Where appropriate, improvements will be made during the re-development of the existing functionality to address business and user needs. The New System will include improvements that take advantage of the capabilities of the new architecture, while not changing the way the State and counties conduct business. The current Child Welfare Services/Case Management System (CWS/CMS) will be maintained during the development and decommissioned upon statewide implementation of the New System.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise will be implemented in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.5.
- \$617,000 of these funds have been redirected from the Go Forward Plan Project.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Costs are based on the April 2006 New System Planning Advanced Planning Document (PAPD).

### **FUNDING:**

The cost allocation reflects a SACWIS methodology. Federal funding is based on the federal cost allocation plan for CWS/CMS. Federally eligible costs are shared at 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent state. This change is in accordance with ACF direction as provided in their letter dated October 12, 2004.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

This is a new premise.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

This is a new premise.

## CWS/CMS New System Project

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$2,956
Federal	0	1,478
State	0	1,478
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

### CDSS/OSI PARTNERSHIP:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$0	\$2,956
CDSS	0	0
OSI	0	2,956

## Child Health and Safety Fund

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the distribution of funding to counties from the Child Health and Safety Fund (CHSF) for child abuse prevention in the community. Assembly Bill 3087 (Chapter 1316, Statutes of 1992) established the CHSF for specified purposes. Monies for this fund are generated through the Department of Motor Vehicles' (DMV) "Have a Heart, Be a Star, Help our Kids" license plate program pursuant to Vehicle Code Section 5072.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 18285.
- Of the license plate monies, up to 25 percent may be used for child abuse prevention, and of that 25 percent, 90 percent (i.e., 22.5 percent of the total revenue) is to be provided to counties (county children's trust funds) for support of child abuse prevention services in the community [W&IC section 18285(e)(1)].
- The total actual CHSF license plate revenue for Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05 was \$3,901,000

### METHODOLOGY:

Using the prior year's actual revenue as the base, 22.5 percent will be transferred to the counties for child abuse prevention activities ( $\$3,901,000 \times 22.5 \text{ percent} = \$877,725$ ) for FY 2006-07.

### FUNDING:

All funds are provided by the CHSF.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase reflects an update in the revenue base used in the calculation.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$615	\$878
Federal	0	0
State	615	878
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

---

## Supportive and Therapeutic Options Program (STOP)

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs for providing expanded therapeutic day services as an alternative to placement in foster care and as a means of reunifying children with their families from these placements. These services are provided to families with children and youth returning from out-of-home placement or at-risk of such placements that cannot access services through current mental health services or other funding mechanisms. Services target a broader number of children than the current child welfare services population such as children and youth at-risk of placement and those exiting foster care. Funds provide supportive and therapeutic services in order to prevent placement in out-of-home care and/or provide aftercare services to facilitate a successful transition to home or community from out-of-home care placements.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in August 1998.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 16500, 16508.2, and 16508.3.
- The Department of Mental Health's annual cost for mental health services per child in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is assumed to be \$5,230.
- For FY 2006-07, the cost for mental health services per child is assumed to be \$5,404.

### METHODOLOGY:

The funding for FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 is being held to the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level. Initially, cost for this program was calculated by multiplying the estimated number of children to be served by the cost per case for mental health services.

### FUNDING:

This premise is shared 70 percent state and 30 percent county.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

---

## Supportive and Therapeutic Options Program (STOP)

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$14,220	\$14,220
Federal	0	0
State	9,954	9,954
County	4,266	4,266
Reimbursements	0	0

## Group Home Monthly Visits

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of providing monthly visits to all foster care children placed in group homes (GHs), both in-state and out-of-state. This premise was authorized by Senate Bill 933 (Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998).

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1998.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16516.5.
- The in-state GH caseload is projected to be 11,427 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and 11,315 for FY 2006-07 based on data as reported on the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System. The out-of-state GH caseload is estimated at 173 for FY 2005-06 and 122 for FY 2006-07.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60 for each fiscal year.
- For the out-of-state placements, it is assumed that an average of two cases can be visited per trip.
- All GH placements will receive ten additional visits per year.
- In-state visits will take an average of two hours per visit and out-of-state visits will take an average of 12 hours to visit two cases.
- Based on caseload data for in-state GH placements, 4,402 cases are placed out-of-county for FY 2005-06, and 4,494 cases for FY 2006-07. For each FY, these cases have been budgeted to include an additional two hours of travel time.
- For both fiscal years, out-of-state per diem costs are estimated at \$124 and out-of-state travel costs are estimated at \$500.

### METHODOLOGY:

- For each fiscal year, the in-state costs for ten visits are calculated using the in-state GH caseload for two hours per visit multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.
- An additional two hours are calculated for the in-state, out-of-county placements at the hourly cost of a social worker.
- The out-of-state costs for ten visits are calculated using the out-of-state GH caseload divided by two (two cases per visit) for 12 hours per visit multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.
- Per diem and travel costs are added for each out-of-state visit.



## Group Home Monthly Visits

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent State General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

For FY 2006-07, the reduction is due to a decrease in caseload.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease is due to a decrease in caseload.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$18,520	\$17,990
Federal	6,945	6,746
State	11,575	11,244
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Background Checks

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with conducting background checks prior to placing children in the home of a relative, or the home of any other person who is not a licensed foster parent. Pursuant to Assembly Bill 1695 (Chapter 653, Statutes of 2001), all unlicensed foster parents must meet the same standards set forth in regulations for the licensing of foster family homes. Therefore, all unlicensed foster parents will be subject to a background check to be conducted through the Child Abuse Index, the Department of Justice and the Federal Bureau of Investigations.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1999.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 361.4.
- The caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is 23,838 based on new placement data for FY 2003-04. The caseload for FY 2006-07 is 26,974, based on new placement data for Calendar Year 2005.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors' Association, it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children is placed per home.
- It is assumed that an average of two persons in the home will require background checks.
- The cost for the Child Abuse Index check is estimated at \$15 per check.
- Costs for a Department of Justice background check through the Live Scan System are \$32 along with a \$16 application fee per check.
- The Federal Bureau of Investigations background check is \$24.

### METHODOLOGY:

The costs are calculated by dividing the caseload by number of placements per home, multiplied by two persons in the home requiring background checks, multiplied by the cost for background checks.

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent State General Fund.

## Background Checks

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The FY 2006-07 reduction is due to a decrease in caseload.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase is due to an increase in caseload.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$2,659	\$3,009
Federal	997	1,128
State	1,662	1,881
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Relative Home Approvals

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with conducting an in-home approval prior to placing children in the home of a relative, or the home of a nonrelative extended family member (Initial Approvals). This premise also reflects the cost of conducting an annual visit for continued approval of a relative home (Annual Approvals). Assembly Bill (AB) 1695 (Chapter 653, Statutes of 2001) requires the county welfare department to conduct an in-home inspection to assess the safety of the home and the ability of the relative to care for the child's needs. The bill stipulates that the standards used to evaluate and grant or deny approval of the home of the relative shall be the same standards set forth in regulations for the licensing of foster family homes. However, all homes will require an annual reassessment as opposed to targeted visits for continued licensure of foster family homes.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented January 1, 2002.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 309(d).
- The caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is 23,838 based on new placement data for FY 2003-04. The caseload for FY 2006-07 is 26,974, based on new placement data for FY 2004-05.
- The existing caseload for FY 2005-06 is 30,009 based on placement data for February 2005. The existing caseload for FY 2006-07 is 29,735 based on placement data for January 2006.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors' Association (CWDA), it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children is placed per home.
- Based on information from the CWDA, it is assumed that it will take an average of nine hours to complete the additional activities associated with conducting an initial approval equivalent to the licensure of a foster family home.
- It is assumed that it will take an average of three hours to conduct an annual visit for reapproval of the home.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60 for each FY.

### METHODOLOGY:

Costs for the initial assessments are calculated by dividing the new caseload by the number of children per home, multiplied by the number of hours for approval, multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker. Costs for annual reapprovals are then calculated for the existing caseload.

## Relative Home Approvals

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 70 percent State General Fund and 30 percent county.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

For FY 2006-07, the reduction is due to a decrease in new caseload and existing caseload.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The net increase is due to an increase in new caseload and a decrease in existing caseload.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

<b>Initial</b>	2005-06	2006-07	<b>Annual</b>	2005-06	2006-07
<b>Approvals:</b>			<b>Approvals:</b>		
	County Admin.	County Admin.		County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$9,984	\$11,298	Total	\$4,190	\$4,151
Federal	3,744	4,237	Federal	1,571	1,557
State	4,368	4,943	State	1,833	1,816
County	1,872	2,118	County	786	778
Reimbursements	0	0	Reimbursements	0	0

<b>COMBINED</b>	2005-06	2006-07
<b>TOTAL:</b>		
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$14,174	\$15,449
Federal	5,315	5,794
State	6,201	6,759
County	2,658	2,896
Reimbursements	0	0

## Multiple Relative Home Approvals

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with conducting additional approvals when more than one relative or non-related extended family member is seeking to have related foster children placed with them. These additional approvals of all willing relatives or non-related extended family members are necessary in order to fairly establish viable placement options and to better enable the State to meet the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act requirement that approval of relative homes be in compliance with foster family home licensing/approval standards.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on December 1, 2002.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 309(d).
- The caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is 23,838 based on new placement data for FY 2003-04. The caseload for FY 2006-07 is 26,974, based on new placement data for Calendar Year 2005.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors' Association (CWDA), it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children is placed per home.
- It is assumed that 30 percent of the placements have more than one party interested in receiving the placement.
- It is assumed that there are two to three (2.5 average) interested parties per placement. Therefore, since the "Relative Home Approvals" premise already provides for one assessment, there is an average of 1.5 additional homes that require approvals.
- Based on information from CWDA, it is assumed that it will take an average of 15 hours to assess each home for approval.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60 for both fiscal years.

### METHODOLOGY:

The number of approvals to be conducted is calculated by dividing the caseload by the average placements per home, then multiplying by the percentage of placements with multiple interest, multiplied by the additional homes requiring approval. Annual costs are calculated by multiplying the number of approvals by the number of hours per approval multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent State General Fund and 30 percent county.

## Multiple Relative Home Approvals

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The FY 2006-07 reduction is due to a decrease in caseload.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase is due to an increase in caseload.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$7,488	\$8,473
Federal	2,808	3,177
State	3,276	3,707
County	1,404	1,589
Reimbursements	0	0

## Grievance Review for Relatives

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with providing a review process upon request for relatives seeking to have related foster children placed with them but who are determined not to meet approval standards established by law and regulation. Making a grievance review available to relatives disapproved prior to placement is necessary to afford due process through an objective review of the basis for the disapproval and to better enable the State to meet the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act requirement that approval of relative homes be in compliance with foster family home licensing/approval standards.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2003.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 309(d).
- The caseload for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 is 23,838 based on new placement data for FY 2003-04. The caseload for FY 2006-07 is 26,974, based on new placement data for Calendar Year 2005.
- Based on information from the California Welfare Directors' Association, it is assumed that an average of 1.56 children is placed per home.
- It is assumed that 30 percent of the placements have more than one party interested in receiving the placement.
- It is assumed that there are two to three (2.5 average) interested parties per placement.
- It is assumed that 45 percent of homes will be disapproved.
- It is assumed that 20 percent of those whose homes are disapproved will request a review.
- It is assumed that it will take an average of eight hours to review each case.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60 for both fiscal years.

### METHODOLOGY:

The number of reviews to be conducted is calculated by dividing the caseload by the average placements per home, then multiplying by the percentage of placements with multiple interest, multiplied by the average interested parties per placement, then multiplying by the percent of homes that are disapproved and the percent of those requesting a review. Annual costs are calculated by multiplying the number of reviews by the number of hours per review multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.



## Grievance Review for Relatives

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent State General Fund and 30 percent county.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The FY 2006-07 reduction is due to a decrease in caseload.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase is due to an increase in caseload.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$600	\$678
Federal	225	254
State	262	297
County	113	127
Reimbursements	0	0

## Live Scan Technology

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to maintain Live Scan machines in the 58 county child welfare services agencies for the Foster Care program. Before a child can be placed in a foster home or an unlicensed relative or guardian home, caregivers must clear a criminal record check. Live Scan technology provides the capability to do instantaneous criminal record checks from fingerprints. Providing and maintaining Live Scan machines to the child welfare agencies allow for immediate onsite fingerprint processing.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Assembly Bill 1740 (Chapter 52, Statutes of 2000).
- The 58 counties were provided funds to purchase 100 Live Scan machines in Fiscal Year (FY) 2000-01.
- Costs are negotiated and contracted with a Live Scan vendor by each of the counties.
- Contract costs for on-going maintenance are based on an existing Live Scan contract for Community Care Licensing activities.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is based on an existing Live Scan contract to provide on-going maintenance.

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent State General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## Live Scan Technology

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,200	\$1,200
Federal	450	450
State	750	750
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Health Services for Children in Foster Care

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost to fund positions for public health care nurses (PHNs) in the county welfare departments. These nurses will provide enhanced health services to children entering foster care. As authorized by Assembly Bill 1111 (Chapter 147, Statutes of 1999), this program will improve the physical, mental, dental, and developmental well being of children in the child welfare system. The PHNs funded through this program shall work closely with the child's caseworker or probation officer to coordinate health care services and serve as a liaison with health care professionals and other providers of health related services.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2000.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 16501.3.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, the number of new cases added to foster care is 45,304 based on actual data from July 2004 to June 2005. For FY 2006-07, the projected new cases added to foster care is 44,853. The projection is based on the previous 24 months of actual data.
- The new foster care caseload per PHN is based on a 1:200 ratio.
- The cost for a PHN for FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 is being held to the FY 2004-05 level of \$104,039.
- The matching State General Funds (25 percent) are reflected in the California Department of Social Services' (CDSS) budget and, through an interagency agreement, passed over to the budget of the Department of Health Services (DHS).

### METHODOLOGY:

#### FY 2005-06

The new foster care caseload is divided by the number of annual cases per PHN, then multiplied by the unit cost of a PHN to determine the total cost of the program ( $45,304 \div 200 \times \$104,039$ ). The total funds are multiplied by 25 percent to calculate the amount reflected in the CDSS budget and the remaining 75 percent of the funds are reflected in the budget of the DHS.

#### FY 2006-07

The projected new foster care caseload is divided by the number of annual cases per PHN, then multiplied by the unit cost of a PHN to determine the total cost of the program ( $44,853 \div 200 \times \$104,039$ ). The total funds are multiplied by 25 percent to calculate the amount reflected in the CDSS budget and the remaining 75 percent of the funds are reflected in the budget of the DHS.

## Health Services for Children in Foster Care

### FUNDING:

This program is eligible for enhanced federal Title XIX funding of 75 percent with a match of 25 percent State General Funds.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

For FY 2005-06, there is no change. For FY 2006-07, the decrease reflects caseload data that was lower than projected.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Based on 24 months of prior caseload data, the FY 2006-07 foster care caseload is projected to decrease.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$5,892	\$5,833
Federal	0	0
State	5,892	5,833
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **County Self-Assessment and System Improvement Planning (SIP) Development**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the cost to provide funding to counties to support the additional administrative responsibility related to the planning and coordination of the periodic county Child Welfare Services (CWS) performance self-assessments and annual System Improvement Plans (SIPs) as required by Assembly Bill (AB) 636 (Chapter 678, Statutes of 2002). Self-assessments and SIPs are critical and mandated components of the new CWS outcomes and accountability systems that require full and continuous participation by the public, service recipients, providers, courts, and agencies participating in CWS and are necessary to ensure a comprehensive, efficient, and non-duplicative approach to CWS assessment, design and operations.

Additional staff resources are necessary for the new function of identifying, selecting, updating membership, providing information, and coordinating the activities of the wide range of participants that include: advocates, the general public, law enforcement, courts, health and mental health agencies, local education, foster parents, foster youth, service recipient parents, and tribal organizations.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented January 1, 2004.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2004.
- Eighty-seven staff, at the social worker level, are budgeted to perform these duties for each fiscal year (FY).
- The statewide average cost of a social worker is \$129,074 for each FY.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The estimate is calculated for each FY by multiplying the number of social workers by the statewide average cost of a social worker.

### **FUNDING:**

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent State General Fund and 30 percent county.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change.

## County Self-Assessment and System Improvement Planning (SIP) Development

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$11,230	\$11,230
Federal	4,211	4,211
State	4,913	4,913
County	2,106	2,106
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## Data Requirements for New Activities

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost related to the additional data requirements associated with the many new mandated activities counties must accomplish to implement the Program Improvement Plan (PIP) and the California Child & Family Services Review process authorized by Assembly Bill 636 (Chapter 678, Statutes of 2002). Counties must review and update data already contained in the Child Welfare Services/Case Management System to ensure the new required data elements are entered into the case files. Counties must also spend additional time entering these additional data requirements in all new cases as they are created. This effort must be accomplished so that it is possible to measure program improvement progress as required in the PIP in order to avoid federal penalties.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented January 1, 2004.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2005.
- The Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 estimates are for new cases only.
- The new caseload is 58,957 for FY 2005-06 based on actual data for FY 2003-04 and 61,166 for FY 2006-07 based on actual data for FY 2004-05.
- It is assumed that it will take an average of 15 minutes per case to enter data for all new cases.
- The hourly cost of a social worker is \$72.60 for each FY.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimate is calculated by multiplying the caseload by the number of hours per case and then by the hourly cost of a social worker.

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent State General Fund and 30 percent county.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

For FY 2006-07, the increase is due to an increase in caseload.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase is due to an increase in caseload.



## Data Requirements for New Activities

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,070	\$1,111
Federal	401	417
State	468	486
County	201	208
Reimbursements	0	0

## Peer Quality Case Reviews

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the cost associated with backfilling and travel and per diem costs for social workers and probation officers participating in Peer Quality Case Reviews (PQCR) as required by Assembly Bill 636 (Chapter 678, Statutes of 2001). The purpose of the PQCR is to learn, through intensive examination of county child welfare practice, how to improve child welfare services and practices in California, both in the participating county and in other jurisdictions as well. Without relying on the PQCR as a vehicle for validating the quantitative data contained within each county's County Data Report and Self Assessment, the PQCR should provide another layer of information. Specifically, the PQCR will be another mechanism for understanding the key to the child welfare system and social worker practice. While the quantitative data provides integral, population-based information, the PQCR will provide a rich and deep understanding of actual practice in the field. In addition, the PQCR goes beyond the County Self-Assessment by incorporating outside expertise, including county peers, to help identify the strengths and weaknesses of county child welfare services delivery systems, and social worker and probation officer practices.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented July 1, 2004.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 10601.2.
- There will be 20 counties completing County Welfare Department (CWD) and County Probation Department (CPD) reviews in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and 22 counties completing CWD reviews and 27 counties completing CPD reviews in FY 2006-07.
- Each CWD review will take approximately five days to complete and will involve an average of 16 staff; eight staff from the county being reviewed and eight staff from other counties. Each CPD review will take approximately three days to complete and will involve an average of 16 staff; eight staff from the county being reviewed and eight staff from other counties.
- Based on information from the County Welfare Directors Association, it will require a total of 712 hours of social worker time for each CWD review, which also includes time for preparation, coordination and training for the reviews and completion and review of reports. Each CPD review will take approximately three-fifths the time of a CWD review, or 427 hours of probation worker time.
- The hourly cost of a worker is \$72.60.
- Eight social workers from other counties will participate in each county review and will require travel and per diem costs of \$124.00 per day.
- \$20,000 of state support is included in the premise.

## Peer Quality Case Reviews

### METHODOLOGY:

The total number of worker hours per review is multiplied by the number of reviews and then by the worker cost per hour. Costs are then added for travel and per diem for eight visiting workers for each of the reviews at \$124.00 per day. An additional \$20,000 is added for state staff's travel and per diem.

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are shared 70 percent State General Fund and 30 percent county.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The number of CPD reviews in FY 2006-07 has increased from 22 to 27.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The number of CPD reviews has increased from 22 to 27.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,858	\$2,204
Federal	697	827
State	813	964
County	348	413
Reimbursements	0	0

## Statewide Standardized Training

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the additional costs associated with the need for counties to backfill behind county social workers and supervisors who must attend additional days of training, as required under the statewide standardized common core curriculum for all current and new child welfare, and probation workers, and their supervisors. The additional training days resulted from California's negotiation of the federal Children and Family Services Review (CFSR) Program Improvement Plan (PIP) which was aimed at improving outcomes for children in foster care. The PIP required that the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) develop regulations which would mandate the standardized training curricula which will result in up to four additional days of training. The standardized curricula and additional days of training were also added to the Training Plan section of the Title IV-B State Plan. The standardized curricula was developed in collaboration with the Statewide Training and Education Committee, which includes representation from all of the Regional Training Academies (RTA) and the Inter-University Consortium (IUC), California Social Work Education Center (CalSWEC), county staff, the tribal community, and other important stakeholders.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement in Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 16200 through 16215.
- The additional days of training were required as part of the CSFR PIP and Title IV-B Training Plan.
- Funding is based on the number of county Full Time Equivalent (FTE's) who will be attending the additional days of training.
- Social workers will attend four additional days of training; social work supervisors will attend two additional days of training; and probation workers will attend three additional days of training.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The estimate is based on the total number of FTEs in each county who will be attending the additional days of training multiplied by the number of hours of training.
- The total hours are then multiplied by the hourly cost of a social worker.

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate of 75 percent is applied for FY 2006-07, federally-eligible costs are shared at 75 percent federal, 17.5 percent State, and 7.5 percent county. Nonfederally eligible costs are funded with 70 percent State, 30 percent county.

## Statewide Standardized Training

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

This is a new premise.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a new premise.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	0	\$19,446
Federal	0	10,939
State	0	5,955
County	0	2,552
Reimbursements	0	0

## CWS Program Improvement Fund

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects donated grants, gifts, or bequests made to the State from private sources to be deposited into the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Program Improvement Fund as established by Assembly Bill 2496 (Chapter 168, Statutes of 2004). These funds are intended to enhance the State's ability to provide a comprehensive system of supports that promote positive outcomes for children and families.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement July 1, 2005.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Donated funds will be eligible for federal Title IV-E enhanced training matching funds.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 75 percent for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2005-06 and 2006-07.

### METHODOLOGY:

A total of \$750,000 in donated funds is expected in both FYs.

### FUNDING:

After applying the foster care federal discount rate, federally-eligible costs are shared 75 percent enhanced federal Title IV-E training funds and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent State General Fund, payable from the CWS Program Improvement Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,715	\$1,715
Federal	965	965
State	750	750
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## **CWS Differential Response (DR), Safety Assessment (SA) and Permanency & Youth Services (PYS)**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects funding for activities related to DR, SA, and PYS that were previously identified as separate premises. Beginning at the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Hotline, the new DR intake system provides a more customized response to families through case planning and development, and provides enhanced services to support the specific needs of children and families. The Standardized Safety Assessment System establishes the standards, tools, and practice applications to improve California's safety outcomes. PYS is aimed at increasing permanence and stability for children in the CWS system as well as supporting foster youth as they transition to adulthood.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented July 1, 2005.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- This premise provides funding for continued implementation in the 11 counties (Contra Costa, Glenn, Humboldt, Los Angeles, Placer, Sacramento, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Stanislaus, Tehama, and Trinity) that received funding in Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05 through other existing fund sources.
- Additional funding is provided for state level contracts for training and technical assistance in support of the DR, SA, and PYS activities.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 75 percent.
- For FY 2005-06, all activities are assumed eligible for federal Title IV-E funding. For FY 2006-07, it is assumed that a portion of activities for DR are ineligible for federal Title IV-E funding and are funded with 100 percent General Fund (GF).

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Funding for the 11 counties is \$13,002,000. An additional \$743,000 is provided for state contracts.

### **FUNDING:**

After applying the foster care federal discount rate, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal for the non-enhanced expenditures and 75 percent enhanced federal Title IV-E training funds and 25 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent GF.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

For FY 2006-07, a portion of costs are ineligible for federal Title IV-E funding and are funded with 100 percent GF.



## **CWS Differential Response (DR), Safety Assessment (SA) and Permanency & Youth Services (PYS)**

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

A portion of costs are ineligible for federal Title IV-E funding and are funded with 100 percent GF.

### **EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$13,745	\$13,745
Federal	5,903	5,490
State	7,842	8,255
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## **CWS Differential Response (DR), Safety Assessment (SA) and Permanency & Youth Services (PYS) – County Expansions**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects funding for county expansions of activities related to DR, SA, and PYS that were first piloted in 11 counties. Beginning at the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Hotline, the new DR intake system provides a more customized response to families through case planning and development, and provides enhanced services to support the specific needs of children and families. The Standardized Safety Assessment System establishes the standards, tools, and practice application to improve California's safety outcomes. PYS is aimed at increasing permanence and stability for children in the CWS system as well as supporting foster youth as they transition to adulthood.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise will implement July 1, 2006.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- This premise provides funding to expand DR, SA, and PYS to an additional 15 counties and to expand SA only to an additional three counties.
- A total of \$1.3 million is estimated for each of the 15 counties implementing DR, SA, and PYS based on the current allocation for the 11 pilot counties.
- A total of \$23,000 is estimated for each of the three counties implementing SA only.
- A portion of activities related to DR is ineligible for federal Title IV-E funding and is funded with 100 percent General Fund (GF).
- The foster care federal discount rate is 75 percent.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

Funding is estimated at \$1.3 million for each of the 15 counties implementing DR, SA, and PYS. Funding is estimated at \$23,000 for each of the three counties implementing SA only.

### **FUNDING:**

After applying the foster care federal discount rate, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal for the non-enhanced expenditures and 75 percent enhanced federal Title IV-E training funds and 25 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent GF.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

This is a new premise.

## **CWS Differential Response (DR), Safety Assessment (SA) and Permanency & Youth Services (PYS) – County Expansions**

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

This is a new premise.

### **EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$19,572
Federal	0	7,638
State	0	11,934
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **CWS Outcome Improvement Project**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects funding for county child welfare and probation agencies to enhance/modify their existing service delivery systems to improve outcomes for children and families consistent with the strategies contained in the county System Improvement Plans approved by each county's Board of Supervisors. These plans are required under the new California Child and Family Services Review, pursuant to Chapter 678, Statutes of 2001 (Assembly Bill 636). Improvements in the area of safety are a priority. In addition, the eleven Child Welfare Services (CWS) Program Improvement pilot counties can access these funds to support ongoing development of their Standardized Safety Assessment System, Differential Response, and Youth Permanency programs. The California Department of Social Services anticipates that there will be both one-time and ongoing costs for improvements that could include specialized training, equipment, consultant services, enhanced staffing, and expanded service capacity.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented July 1, 2005.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, the Budget Act of 2005 appropriated a total of \$12,862,000 for these activities; \$5,862,000 is reflected in this premise and \$7,000,000 in reappropriated funds are reflected in the "State Children's Trust Fund" and "Promoting Safe and Stable Families" (PSSF) premises.
- The total funding for FY 2006-07 will remain at \$12,862,000.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 75 percent.
- For FY 2006-07, 55 percent of the activities are ineligible for federal Title IV-E funding.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The FY 2005-06 estimate is being held at the Budget Act of 2005 appropriation level. Funding for FY 2006-07 will remain at the total FY 2005-06 level.

### **FUNDING:**

Federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal, after applying the foster care federal discount rate. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent General Fund (GF).

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

For FY 2006-07, 55 percent of the activities are ineligible for federal Title IV-E funding and are funded with 100 percent GF.

## CWS Outcome Improvement Project

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase is due to the unavailability of \$7,000,000 in reappropriated funds in other premises.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$5,862	\$12,862
Federal	2,198	2,170
State	3,664	10,692
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **AB 408 Child Relationships (Amended by AB 1412)**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs for social workers to perform additional activities on every initial and six month case plan and court report on children 10 years of age and older who are placed in group homes for more than six months to establish a special relationship with an important person in the child's life as stipulated by Assembly Bill (AB) 408 (Chapter 813, Statutes of 2003). Social workers will conduct investigations to identify these individuals, evaluate and assess relationships between foster children and other important people in their lives, excluding siblings, and take necessary actions to maintain these relationships. These identified persons will be included in the child's Transitional Independent Living Plan (TILP).

Effective January 1, 2006, the provisions of AB 408 are amended as stipulated by AB 1412 (Chapter 640, Statutes of 2005) to include all children who are developmentally appropriate and who are in out-of-home placements. In addition, the social workers will insure that developmentally appropriate children are involved in the development of their case plan, help plan for permanent placement, and that children 12 years of age or older review their case plan, sign it, and receive a copy.

The implementation and operation of the amendments are to be budgeted by phases.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 2004 and is amended on January 1, 2006.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

Authorizing statute: AB 408 (Chapter 813, Statutes of 2003) and AB 1412 (Chapter 640, Statutes of 2005).

#### AB 408

The provisions of AB 408 are being held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation Level.

#### AB 1412

- Implementation of AB 1412 is being delayed until July 1, 2006.
- There are approximately 30,000 children 10 years of age and older and placed with a nonrelative for six months or longer.
- There are approximately 13,000 children 10 years of age and older and placed with a permanent placement (PP) relative for six months or longer.
- There are approximately 4,000 children 10 years of age and older and who have been in out-of-home placement for six months or longer.
- There are approximately 17,000 children 8 to 11 years older who are developmentally appropriate to participate in their case plan development.
- There are approximately 46,000 children 12 years and older who will review and sign their case plan.

## **AB 408 Child Relationships (Amended by AB 1412)**

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):**

- One out of every four relationships initially assessed will not be deemed in the child's best interest. In such cases, another relationship will be assessed, which will require four additional hours of social worker time.
- For Phase I, a social worker will spend at least 4 hours per case for the initial assessment of new cases for children 10 years and older placed with a non-relative for six months or longer and one-half hour for one-half of the new cases for a six month case plan/court report.
- For Phase II, a social worker will spend at least 15 minutes for Phase I children for the six months court report and at least 4 hours per case for the children 10 years and older placed in PP relative care for six months or longer and one-half hour for the PP cases for the six month case plan/court report.
- For Phase III, a social worker will spend at least 15 minutes for Phase I and Phase II children for the six months court report, at least 4 hours per case for the children 10 years and older placed in out-of-home placement for more than six months and one-half hour for the out-of-home placement cases for the six month case plan/court report.
- The social worker cost per hour is \$72.60.
- Background checks will be performed on each initial and additional assessment case at a cost of \$87.00 per case.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The provisions of AB 408 for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2005-06 and 2006-07 are held at the Budget Act of 2005 Appropriation level.

The implementation of the provisions of AB 1412 is being delayed until July 1, 2006. Therefore, beginning in FY 2006-07 the costs will be phased in according to the placement of the children. The estimate is calculated by multiplying the amount of time by the frequency of activity per year by social worker rate and by the number of cases. In addition, the background check cost is added to the total.

### **FUNDING:**

After the foster care federal discount rate for FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 is applied, costs are shared 50 percent federal and the nonfederal portion is funded 70 percent with State General Fund and 30 percent county funds.

### **CHANGE FROM THE APPROPRIATION:**

There is no change.

## AB 408 Child Relationships (Amended by AB 1412)

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase reflects the costs to implement and operate the amendments as stipulated by AB 1412.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

Total	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$5,189	\$22,965
Federal	1,946	8,612
State	2,270	10,047
County	973	4,306
Reimbursements	0	0
AB 408	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$5,189	\$5,189
Federal	1,946	1,946
State	2,270	2,270
County	973	973
Reimbursements	0	0
AB 1412	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$17,776
Federal	0	6,666
State	0	7,777
County	0	3,333
Reimbursements	0	0



***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Adoptions Program – Basic Costs

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects costs associated with agency (relinquishment) and independent adoptions for 30 counties. Although only 28 counties provide adoptive services, these costs include funding for independent adoptions and services in two adjacent counties. Relinquishment and agency adoption include:

1. Agency (Relinquishment) Adoptions - Placements through a licensed adoption agency in which a child to be adopted has been relinquished by his or her legal parents or in which, due to abuse or neglect, parental rights have been terminated by court action; and
2. Independent Adoptions - Placements in which the parents place a child directly with an adopting family or persons of their choice.

The 1996 Adoptions Initiative (Assembly Bill 1524, Chapter 1083, Statutes of 1996) was introduced to maximize adoption opportunities for children in public foster care and reduce the foster care population. Counties were funded based on performance agreements that increased the number of adoption social workers in an effort to double the number of statewide adoptive placements. As a result of the Adoptions Initiative, the annual number of foster children who were placed in an adoptive home increased from 3,000 to over 7,200.

Previously, this premise was separated from the Adoptions Initiative premise in order to illustrate the fiscal impact of the Initiative. However, since achieving the goal of doubling the number of statewide adoptions, this premise now combines the Adoptions Initiative with the Adoption Program basic costs to fund the program with 560.55 full-time equivalents (FTEs).

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 16100 through 16106.
- The counties are funded with 560.55 FTEs in each Fiscal Year (FY).
- The statewide average annual unit cost of an adoption worker was held at \$128,564 for each FY.
- Additional federal spending authority in the amount of \$1,388,424 for FY 2005-06 and \$696,480 for FY 2006-07 is included based on actual historical expenditure data.

### METHODOLOGY:

- Estimates are individually calculated for each county that performs its own adoptive services by multiplying the number of FTEs by the county's annual adoption worker unit cost.
- Additional federal funds are included to bring the federal spending authority up to a level based on actual historical expenditure data.

## Adoptions Program – Basic Costs

### FUNDING:

The sharing ratio for FY 2005-06 is 43.33 percent federal and 56.67 percent nonfederal based on actual expenditure data from FY 2003-04. The sharing ratio for FY 2006-07 is 43.67 percent federal and 56.33 percent nonfederal based on actual expenditure data from FY 2003-04. The nonfederal share is 100 percent State General Fund (GF). Additional federal funding is included in the amount of \$1,388,424 for FY 2005-06 and \$696,480 for FY 2006-07 to provide sufficient federal spending authority to a level based on actual historical expenditure data.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The federal sharing ratio has increased and the amount of additional federal funding has decreased.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The nonfederal sharing ratio has decreased and the amount of additional federal funding has decreased.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$73,456	\$72,764
Federal	32,728	32,225
State	40,728	40,539
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Improving Adoptions Outcomes

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs and savings associated with augmenting county adoption funding to improve permanency outcomes for children via adoption resulting in increased foster care exits. The funding is provided to hire additional adoptions caseworkers to increase the number of finalized adoptions.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise will implement on July 1, 2006.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: The Budget Act of 2006.
- In Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07, funding is provided to hire additional adoptions caseworkers to produce 1,000 adoptions finalizations.
- Due to hiring timelines and processes during the first year of implementation, adoption finalizations will not begin to occur until January of 2007.
- During FY 2006-07, 500 adoptions will be phased-in over six months from January through June of 2007, resulting in 1,750 casemonths.
- Adoption Assistance Payment (AAP) Program costs are based on the average Foster Family Homes (FFH) grant of \$711.12.
- Foster Care (FC) grant savings for FY 2006-07 are based on cases moving from FFH and Foster Family Agencies (FFA). The weighted average grant amount is \$799.67.
- Child Welfare Services (CWS) administrative savings of \$347.40 per permanent placement case each month will be realized as a result of cases exiting the child welfare system.
- FC and AAP administrative savings are the average cost per case based on actual data.

### METHODOLOGY:

- A 1,000 case increase in adoptions represents a 15.55 percent increase over actual adoptions finalized during FY 2003-04. Therefore, the additional cost to the Adoptions Program was calculated based on a 15.55 percent increase in funding over the FY 2006-07 Adoptions Basic Program estimate before the additional federal spending authority is added.
- The AAP estimate was calculated by multiplying the average federal and nonfederal FFH grant by the projected 1,750 casemonths.
- To estimate the FC Program savings, the projected number of casemonths avoided due to cases exiting the FC Program is multiplied by the FFH and FFA weighted average foster care grant. CWS administrative savings are calculated by applying the permanent placement cost per case to total casemonths avoided due to cases exiting from the child welfare system. Net FC and AAP administrative savings are calculated by multiplying the average cost per case by the projected casemonths.

## Improving Adoptions Outcomes

### FUNDING:

The Adoptions Program, AAP Program, FC Program, FC Administration and CWS Administrative costs/savings are shared at the same ratios as in their respective programs.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

Costs and savings per case, as well as sharing ratios have been updated.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This is a new premise implementing in the Budget Year.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

ITEM 101 – AAP Grant Costs	2005-06 Grant	2006-07 Grant
Total	\$0	\$1,245
Federal	0	622
State	0	467
County	0	156
Reimbursements	0	0

ITEM 101 – Foster Care Savings	2005-06 Grant	2006-07 Grant
Total	\$0	-\$1,400
Federal	0	-700
State	0	-280
County	0	-420
Reimbursements	0	0

## Improving Adoptions Outcomes

### EXPENDITURES (continued):

(in 000s)

<b>ITEM 141 –</b>	2005-06	2006-07
<b>Foster Care Admin</b>	County Admin.	County Admin.
<b>Savings</b>		
Total	\$0	-\$152
Federal	0	-76
State	0	-53
County	0	-23
Reimbursements	0	0
 <b>ITEM 151 –</b>	 2005-06	 2006-07
<b>CWS Admin Savings</b>	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	-\$51
Federal	0	-19
State	0	-22
County	0	-10
Reimbursements	0	0
 <b>ITEM 151 –</b>	 2005-06	 2006-07
<b>Adoptions Cost</b>	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$0	\$11,207
Federal	0	4,903
State	0	6,304
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

# Private Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments

## DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of providing private agency adoption reimbursement payments (PAARPs) to private adoption agencies for expenditures associated with adoptive placements of special needs children. Assembly Bill (AB) 1524 (Chapter 1083, Statutes of 1996) established a \$3,500 compensatory limit per placement of special needs children. AB 1225 (Chapter 905, Statutes of 1999) increased the compensatory limit per placement to \$5,000 per adoptive placement of a special needs child.

Once the child is placed, a claim is submitted to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) for an individual child by the private adoption agency. CDSS program staff review the claim, verify federal eligibility, and forward the claim(s) to the Office of the State Controller for direct issuance of a reimbursement payment to the private adoption agency. Fiscal control is maintained by CDSS program staff.

## IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise originally implemented on July 1, 1992.

The AB 1225 reimbursement payment increase went into effect on July 1, 1999.

## KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 16120 through 16122.
- The caseload is projected at 2,059 for both Fiscal Years (FYs) 2005-06 and 2006-07 based on actual caseload data from FY 2004-05.
- The cost of each PAARP was calculated at \$5,000 per private agency adoptive placement.

## METHODOLOGY:

To determine the PAARP basic cost, the projected number of private agency adoptive placements was multiplied by the average reimbursement cost per placement (2,059 placements x \$5,000 reimbursement per placement).

## FUNDING:

The funding ratio was based on actual claiming data from FY 2004-05. The federal share of cost is 47 percent, and the state share of cost is 53 percent.

## CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The projected caseload has increased based on updated caseload data.

## REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.



## Private Agency Adoption Reimbursement Payments

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$10,295	\$10,295
Federal	4,829	4,829
State	5,466	5,466
County	0	0
Reimbursement	0	0

## Foster and Adoptive Home Recruitment

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with utilizing the services of local community organizations to increase the pool of minority adoptive families in order to place more minority children. The program is administered via contracts between the California Department of Social Services and private providers; counties are not directly involved.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1982.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Federal Multiethnic Placement Act.
- The Foster and Adoptive Home Recruitment Program will fund three contracts with private providers in the current and budget years.

### METHODOLOGY:

- The estimate for Fiscal Years (FYs) 2005-06 and 2006-07 is developed based on anticipated and actual executed contracts.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 75 percent for both FYs.

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent State General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$367	\$367
Federal	138	138
State	229	229
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## County Counsel Costs

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of parental rights termination proceedings for those counties that do not provide their own adoption services. For these counties, Senate Bill 243 (Chapter 1485, Statutes of 1987) transferred the function of terminating parental rights for court dependents from the State Attorney General's Office to the county counsels, effective January 1, 1990.

Cost elements of the parental rights termination function are primarily attorney and paralegal costs; however, they also include minor costs such as publication of notices, process server fees, court reporter fees, sheriff fees, and expert witness fees.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1990.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institution Code Sections 16100 through 16106.
- For Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, the average cost per case is \$2,786 based on actual data from FY 2003-04. For FY 2006-07, the average cost per case is \$3,581 based on actual data from FY 2004-05.
- For those counties that report expenditures, the projected number of children freed for adoption by county counsels is 499 for FY 2005-06 and 440 for FY 2006-07.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 75 percent for each FY.

### METHODOLOGY:

The average cost per case was derived by dividing the expenditures by the number of children freed during that same period. The average cost per case was then multiplied by the projected number of children to be legally freed for adoption.

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, federally-eligible costs are shared 50 percent federal Title IV-E and 50 percent nonfederal. Nonfederal costs are 100 percent State General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

For FY 2006-07, the increase is due to an increase in the cost per case based on updated actual expenditure data.

## County Counsel Costs

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The cost per case has increased and the caseload has decreased.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,392	\$1,574
Federal	522	590
State	870	984
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Nonrecurring Adoption Expenses

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the reimbursement to families for nonrecurring adoption expenses associated with adopting special needs children. These costs may include, but are not limited to, legal fees, court filing fees, special medical examinations, and psychological evaluations. Only families adopting special needs children are eligible for reimbursement of these one-time costs.

The California maximum reimbursement amount is \$400 with a 50 percent federal sharing ratio. Assembly Bill 2129 (Chapter 1089, Statutes of 1993) made this cap permanent.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 1990.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 16120.1.
- The maximum reimbursement that can be applied to each case is \$400.
- Approximately 68 percent of all adopted children can be classified as special needs children.
- An average of 49.15 percent of eligible cases will submit claims in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and 47.58 percent will submit claims in FY 2006-07.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimate was developed by multiplying the projected number of adoptions by the percentage that would qualify as special needs cases (6,166 adoptions x 68 percent). This number was then multiplied by the average percentage of submitted claims, and then by the maximum reimbursement amount.

### FUNDING:

The funding for these reimbursements are shared between federal and state at 50 percent each. There is no county share.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

For FY 2006-07 the percent of eligible cases has increased based on updated actual expenditure data.

## Nonrecurring Adoption Expenses

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The percentage of submitted claims has decreased.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$824	\$798
Federal	412	399
State	412	399
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## Specialized Training for Adoptive Parents (STAP)

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with implementing Assembly Bill (AB) 2198 (Chapter 1014, Statutes of 1998) which provides special training and services to facilitate the adoption of children who are HIV positive or who have a condition of symptoms resulting from substance abuse by the mother. Specifically, this funding will provide recruitment, special training and respite care to families adopting court dependent children who are either HIV positive or assessed as being prenatally exposed to alcohol or a controlled substance. This program is similar to the Child Welfare Services Substance Abuse/HIV Infant Program (Options for Recovery) authorized by AB 67 (Chapter 606, Statutes of 1997).

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1998.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 16135 through 16135.30.
- This program is available to any county requesting participation pursuant to established procedures and to the extent funds are available. There are currently 10 counties (El Dorado, Mendocino, Monterey, Riverside, San Francisco, San Luis Obispo, Santa Clara, Santa Cruz, Shasta, and Stanislaus) that are participating in this program.
- The foster care federal discount rate is 75 percent for each Fiscal Year (FY).

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimate for this program was developed by calculating the costs for each of the three separate components (respite care, training, and recruitment). The total program funding is \$1,871,000, based on the \$1,000,000 State General Fund (GF) appropriation in AB 2198 for the implementation of this program.

### FUNDING:

After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, federally-eligible recruitment activities are funded with 50 percent federal funds and 50 percent nonfederal funds. The nonfederal funds are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

After the foster care federal discount rate is applied, federally-eligible training costs are funded with 75 percent federal funds and 25 percent nonfederal funds. The nonfederal funds are shared 70 percent GF and 30 percent county.

Respite care is funded with 70 percent GF and 30 percent county funds.



## Specialized Training for Adoptive Parents (STAP)

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,871	\$1,871
Federal	442	442
State	1,000	1,000
County	429	429
Reimbursements	0	0

## Nonresident Petitions for Adoption (AB 746)

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with conducting home studies for non-California residents who file a petition for either an agency or independent adoption in the county where the child resides. Assembly Bill (AB) 746 (Chapter 1112, Statutes of 2002) requires a review to be conducted and an endorsed home study report to be completed by either the California Department of Social Services or a California licensed adoption agency. This home study report would need approval in the nonresident petitioner's state.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2003.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Family Code Sections 8714 through 8715, 8802, and 8807.
- AB 746 would result in an increase of 33 more out-of-state adoptions.
- Each new case would require, on average, 2.5 visits per year.
- It would take 16 hours, including travel, to conduct each visit.
- Travel costs are estimated to be \$624 (including per diem) per visit.
- The average hourly cost for a social worker is \$72.60.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimate was developed by first multiplying the number of new cases by the average number of visits required (33 new cases x 2.5 visits per case = 82.5 total visits). The average cost of the social worker (\$72.60 per hour x 16 hours per visit = \$1,162) was added to the travel costs (\$1,162 cost of social worker + \$624 travel costs = \$1,786). This total cost was then multiplied by the number of total visits (82.5 total visits x \$1,786 cost per visit = \$147,345).

### FUNDING:

For Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, the federal share of costs is 43.33 percent and the State General Fund (GF) share is 56.67 percent based on Fiscal Year 2003-04 actual expenditures for the Adoptions Basic program. For FY 2006-07, the federal share of costs is 43.69 percent and the GF share is 56.31 percent based on Fiscal Year 2004-05 actual expenditures for the Adoptions Basic program.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

## Nonresident Petitions for Adoption (AB 746)

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The sharing ratios have been updated based on actual expenditures for the Adoptions Basic program.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$148	\$148
Federal	64	65
State	84	83
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Adoption Opportunity Grant

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects an annual \$350,000 in federal grant funds that the California Department of Social Services will receive for five years, on behalf of Sacramento County, to help promote adoptive placements and to provide services to children in foster care. Services include building a culture of permanence in partner agencies through the enhancement of existing protocols, training and collaborations; implementing changes in current services by engaging project youth in recruitment plans and activities to increase permanency; developing and implementing marketing strategies to increase recruitment of adoptive families; and addressing system barriers by identifying focus issues and enhancing partnerships between advocates, policy makers, and legislators. Sacramento County will contract with Sierra Adoptions Services to provide these services. Sierra Adoptions Services will provide the 11.93 percent nonfederal match required for the grant.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented during Fiscal Year 2003-04.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

Authorizing statute: Senate Bill 1104 (Chapter 229, Statutes of 2004).

### METHODOLOGY:

The amount of funding reflects the annual grant award.

### FUNDING:

Funding is 88.07 percent federal share with an 11.93 percent county match.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## Adoption Opportunity Grant

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$398	\$398
Federal	350	350
State	0	0
County	48	48
Reimbursements	0	0

## County Third Party Contracts

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment (CAPIT) Program. Assembly Bill 1733 (Chapter 1398, Statutes of 1982) established CAPIT to fund prevention and intervention services for children at risk of abuse and/or neglect. Contracts with community-based public and private agencies utilize CAPIT funds to provide services to high-risk children and their families, as well as training and technical assistance to funded agencies. The program includes a local assistance contract component of approximately \$1.0 million which funds innovative, child-centered approaches for the prevention of child abuse and neglect.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 18960 through 18965.
- These funds are used to fulfill federal Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) grant matching and leveraging requirements.

### METHODOLOGY:

Total funding is divided among county allocations, innovative services, and training and technical assistance/state support as follows:

- County Allocations: Counties are allocated a total of \$12,356,000. Small counties receive a preset minimum funding level, and the remaining distribution uses a formula that considers a county's child population (under age 18), children receiving public assistance, and child abuse reports.
- Innovative Services Contracts: There is \$1,039,000 appropriated for innovative services contracts. A competitive bid process determines the grantees of innovative services contracts.
- Training and Technical Assistance (T&TA)/State Support: The funding is \$306,200 to ensure that the programs effectively serve high-risk children and their families, provide for regional training on various child abuse issues and periodic statewide training institutes, and provide state support for the program. Of the \$306,200, \$200,000 is appropriated for a statewide nonprofit consortium. The T&TA/state support amount is not included in the local assistance budget.

### FUNDING:

The CAPIT funding is 100 percent State General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

## County Third Party Contracts

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$13,395	\$13,395
Federal	0	0
State	13,395	13,395
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Federal Grants

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the federal grants associated with assisting local and private agencies in the development and strengthening of child abuse and neglect prevention and treatment programs. These federal grants include those under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act (CAPTA). The CAPTA grants now consist of Title I (consisting of the former Parts A and B) and Title II, otherwise known as the Community-Based Child Abuse Prevention (CBCAP) grant. Approximately fifty percent of each annual CBCAP grant award is allocated to the counties. The CBCAP grant was formerly known as the Community-Based Family Resource and Support (CBFRS) grant.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 18958.
- Project funding is contingent upon continued receipt of federal grant awards.
- CBCAP grant awards are contingent upon using Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment (CAPIT) funds to fulfill nonfederal matching and leveraging requirements.

### METHODOLOGY:

Each federal grant averages approximately \$3 million annually and has a lifetime limit of five years to fully expend the annual grant. This allows states flexibility in the use and support of multi-year projects.

The total reflects the following federal grant:

	<u>2005-06</u>	<u>2006-07</u>
• CAPTA Title I Grants	\$3,058,279	\$3,837,807
• CAPTA Title II – CBCAP Grants	<u>\$3,530,000</u>	<u>\$3,100,000</u>
	\$6,588,279	\$6,937,807

### FUNDING:

Funding for these projects is 100 percent federal grant funds.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06; however, in FY 2006-07, the increase reflects updated CBCAP federal grant.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase reflects updated CBCAP federal grant.



## Federal Grants

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$6,588	\$6,938
Federal	6,588	6,938
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## State Children's Trust Fund Program

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the revenue available for the State Children's Trust Fund (SCTF) in California. The SCTF provides funding for innovative child abuse and neglect prevention and intervention projects utilizing deposits generated from birth certificate surcharges, state income tax designations, and private donations. Project funding is awarded through proposals submitted to the Office of Child Abuse Prevention (OCAP) of the California Department of Social Services (CDSS).

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 18969.
- The Office of the State Controller accounts for deposits to the SCTF and advises CDS as to the availability of funds.

### METHODOLOGY:

This premise reflects the current funding available for the SCTF, as provided by OCAP. For Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, a non-add line has been included in the Detail Tables to reflect the SCTF costs associated with the reappropriation of \$2 million from FY 2004-05 in unspent funds to support the Child Welfare Services (CWS) Program Improvement Plan Project and Assembly Bill (AB) 636 activities.

### FUNDING:

The SCTF is used for research, evaluation, dissemination of information to the public, the establishment of public-private partnerships with foundations and corporations; to increase public awareness about child abuse and neglect via media campaigns, and to seek continued contributions to the fund. For FY 2005-06, SCTF funds will also support the implementation of the CWS Program Improvement Project and AB 636 activities.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease in FY 2006-07 reflects less revenues and less unspent Child Abuse Prevention, Intervention, and Treatment fund transfers.

## State Children's Trust Fund Program

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$3,879	\$1,600
Federal	1,200	0
State	2,679	1,600
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

SCTF	2005-06	2006-07
Reappropriation <sup>1</sup>		
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$2,000	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	2,000	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

1-This is a non-add item.

## County Services Block Grant – Basic Costs

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the County Services Block Grant (CSBG) funding provided to the counties. The CSBG provides funds for Adult Protective Services (APS) and APS administrative costs. The CSBG may also be used to fund related optional services and activities to the extent funds are available.

Non-Medical Out-of-Home Care (NMOHC) administrative costs relating to the Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payment (SSI/SSP) Program are also included in this premise since Fiscal Year (FY) 2000-01. These NMOHC costs were previously reflected in the "Small Programs (non-CalWORKs) Block Grant" premise.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Sections 13004 through 13007.
- The State General Fund (GF) is block granted at \$10.5 million.
- The county match (\$10.9 million) reflects the FY 1996-97 CSBG county expenditure level. Senate Bill 2199 (Chapter 946, Statutes of 1998) required the counties to maintain their FY 1996-97 APS expenditure level for CSBG purposes.
- The Title XIX reimbursement rate is assumed to be 31.70 percent, based on the actual federal reimbursement percentage claimed on the county administrative expense claim for FY 2004-05.

### METHODOLOGY:

- In the current year, estimated costs are computed by adding the GF block grant, the county match and the Title XIX reimbursements ( $\$10,500,000 + \$10,936,000 + \$10,907,758 = \$33,026,387$ ) and the NMOHC costs. The NMOHC costs are estimated to be \$682,629 in the current year.
- In the budget year, the estimated costs are computed by adding the GF block grant, the county match and the Title XIX reimbursements ( $\$10,500,000 + \$10,936,000 + \$10,907,758 = \$32,885,147$ ) and the NMOHC costs. The NMOHC costs are estimated to be \$541,389 in the budget year.

### FUNDING:

- GF for CSBG is block granted at \$10.5 million with county participation at the maintenance of effort level.
- NMOHC is funded with 100 percent GF.
- The Title XIX reimbursements are as follows:
  - ◆ Activities performed by skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 75 percent.
  - ◆ Health-related activities provided to Medi-Cal eligible recipients are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 50 percent.

## County Services Block Grant – Basic Costs

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year increase reflects actual expenditures in the NMOHC and Title XIX reimbursements.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The budget year reduction in total costs reflects a reduction in estimated costs for the NMOHC Program.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$33,027	\$32,885
Federal	0	0
State	11,183	11,041
County	10,936	10,936
Reimbursements	10,908	10,908

## Adult Protective Services

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the funds available over and above the funds provided in the County Services Block Grant (CSBG) for the provision of adult protective services (APS). Senate Bill (SB) 2199 (Chapter 946, Statutes of 1998) established a statewide mandated APS Program and provided these additional funds for expanded APS activities. The county share of APS expenditures was held at the Fiscal Year (FY) 1996-97 county match level for the CSBG. The APS Program has been funded in whole or in part under CSBG since the 1984 Budget Act. The APS Program, administered by the county welfare departments, provides assistance to elderly and dependent adults who are functionally impaired, unable to meet their own needs, and who are victims of abuse, neglect or exploitation.

The APS Program, as defined in SB 2199, requires the counties to respond to reports of elder and dependent adult abuse on a 24-hour emergency response basis. Among the services required by SB 2199 are investigations, needs assessments, and case management services. SB 2199 also provides for necessary tangible resources such as food, emergency shelter care, in-home protection, transportation, and the use of multidisciplinary teams.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

- This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.
- The enhanced APS Program became effective May 1, 1999.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Civil Protection Act, commencing Welfare and Institutions Code section 15600.
- This program received a \$20 million State General Fund (GF) augmentation in the 1998 Budget Act to provide counties with additional resources needed to implement the statewide mandated APS Program. An additional \$25.3 million GF augmentation was provided in the 1999 Budget Act.
- The counties are assumed to have no additional share of the APS costs effective FY 1998-99. SB 2199 held county costs to the FY 1996-97 CSBG expenditure level.

### METHODOLOGY:

The GF estimated expenditures are held at the FY 2002-03 levels and the Federal Title XIX reimbursement is based on actual expenditures for FY 2004-05.

### FUNDING:

- The program is funded with GF and Title XIX reimbursements.
- The Title XIX reimbursements are as follows:
  - ♦ Activities performed by skilled professional medical personnel are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 75 percent; and,

## Adult Protective Services

### FUNDING (continued):

- ◆ Health-related activities provided to Medi-Cal eligible recipients are eligible for Title XIX reimbursement at 50 percent.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-2006	2006-2007
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$84,643	\$84,643
Federal	0	0
State	50,179	50,179
County	0	0
Reimbursements	34,464	34,464

## **APS Contract for Training Curriculum**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the cost of a multi-year contract with a qualified institution, agency or consultant to:

- Develop a comprehensive statewide training curriculum for county Adult Protective Services (APS) workers that will be owned by the State and shared with county APS agencies;
- Present the training curriculum to all APS workers, including scheduling and arranging training in all the regions of the State and producing all required training materials; and,
- Periodically update the curriculum and its content to reflect changing APS laws, policies and practices and provide updated training to APS workers.

The purpose of the training will be to educate county APS workers on the new APS Program standards, requirements, and mandates established by passage of Senate Bill 2199 (Chapter 946, Statutes of 1998), and subsequent legislation. The training is intended to promote statewide uniformity and consistency in the administration and delivery of services under the APS Program.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 2001.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Elder Abuse and Dependent Adult Civil Protection Act, commencing Welfare and Institutions Code Section 15600.
- The cost for ongoing training activities is estimated to be \$176,000 annually.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The funding for this premise reflects the amount of the contract.

### **FUNDING:**

The federal Title XIX reimbursement represents 12.5 percent of the total funding. The nonfederal share is funded with 100 percent State General Fund.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

There is no change.



## APS Contract for Training Curriculum

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Contracts	Contracts
Total	\$176	\$176
Federal	0	0
State	154	154
County	0	0
Reimbursements	22	22

## Enterprise Community Grants

### DESCRIPTION:

The City of Watsonville initially applied for and received the Enterprise Community Grant to be used for activities to empower people and communities to create jobs. This premise reflects the extension of the State's funding authority of unused federal funds allocated for Enterprise Community grants. The current grant is extended through December 31, 2009.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented in December 1994.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The remaining grant balance is assumed at \$244,000.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimated cost for the current year is the remaining grant balance.

### FUNDING:

The grant is 100 percent federally funded.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

This is a new premise.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

This premise will discontinue in budget year.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$244	\$0
Federal	244	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Community Care Licensing - Foster Family Homes

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of providing basic funding for Foster Family Home (FFH) licensing and recruitment services. The California Community Care Facilities Act authorizes counties to provide FFH licensing services. There are currently 41 counties providing FFH licensing and recruitment services. Beginning Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, Yolo County has decided to return their licensing function to the State. FFHs in the remaining 17 counties are licensed by the California Department of Social Services' (CDSS) Community Care Licensing Program District Offices. For these counties, funds are provided for the purpose of recruiting FFH providers.

In FY 2003-04, CDSS implemented a Targeted Visits protocol to streamline the annual review process of licensed care facilities to focus on facilities in which health and safety may be at greatest risk, or those facilities that require an annual visit as a condition of federal funding. A 10 percent sample of the remainder of the facilities is subject to annual unannounced visits. Current law requires that all facilities be visited at least once every five years. Also, if the number of citations increases by 10 percent over the prior year, the number of unannounced visits must also increase by 10 percent.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Health and Safety Code sections 1500 through 1519.
- The workload standards used to determine Full Time Equivalents (FTE) for targeted visits in FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 is 133 and 126 cases per worker, respectively.
- The worker to supervisor ratio used to determine the total number of FTEs is 6.35:1.
- The average statewide unit cost is held at the FY 2002-03 unit cost of \$125,663.

### METHODOLOGY:

#### FY 2005-06

The estimate was developed by determining the number of FTEs based on the FY 2005-06 projected caseload of 7,719. This caseload was divided by the workload standards of cases per worker to derive the number of nonsupervisory FTEs ( $7,719 \text{ cases} \div 133 \text{ cases per worker} = 58.04 \text{ FTEs}$ ). The FTEs were expanded to include supervisors at a ratio of 6.35:1 to determine the total number of FTEs ( $[58.04 \text{ FTEs} \div 6.35 \text{ supervisor ratio}] + 58.04 \text{ FTEs} = 67.18 \text{ FTEs}$ ). The federal and State General Fund (GF) sharing ratio was applied.

The total estimate was derived by adding the recruitment-only allocation to the FFH Program estimate (\$8,441,710 + \$877,764). Since Yolo County has returned their licensing function to the State, their allocation was subtracted from the total. An additional \$3,632,926 in federal spending authority, based on a 3-year average of actual expenditures, was included. The recruitment-only amount is held at the FY 04-05 funding level.

## Community Care Licensing - Foster Family Homes

### METHODOLOGY (continued):

#### FY 2006-07

The estimate was developed by determining the number of FTEs based on an updated FY 2005-06 average caseload of 7,587. This caseload was divided by the workload standards of cases per worker to derive the number of nonsupervisory FTEs ( $7,587 \text{ cases} \div 126 \text{ cases per worker} = 60.21 \text{ FTEs}$ ). The FTEs were expanded to include supervisors at a ratio of 6.35:1 to determine the total number of FTEs [ $(60.21 \text{ FTEs} \div 6.35 \text{ supervisor ratio}) + 60.21 \text{ FTEs} = 69.70 \text{ FTEs}$ ]. The federal and GF sharing ratio was applied.

The total estimate was derived by adding the recruitment-only allocation to the FFH Program estimate (\$8,758,315 + \$877,764). Then, an additional \$3,632,926 in federal spending authority, based on a 3-year average of actual expenditures, was included. The recruitment-only amount is held at the FY 2005-06 funding level.

### FUNDING:

Based on actual expenditure data from FY 2004-05, the sharing ratio for FY 2005-06 and for FY 2006-07 is 42.4 percent federal Title IV-E and 57.6 percent GF. Additional federal spending authority is included based on actual expenditures.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The 41 counties that contract with the State to perform licensing activities are currently staffed to conduct a 10 percent annual random of licensing functions which will not meet the statutory requirement that all facilities be visited at least once every five years. The increase reflects the necessary funds to meet the existing mandate of facility visits. Also, the average caseload has been updated. The average caseload is higher than projected in the November 2005 Subvention.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$12,925	\$13,269
Federal	7,556	7,719
State	5,369	5,550
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

---

## Family Child Care Homes – Basic Costs

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs of providing basic funding to six counties for family child care home (FCCH) licensing services and, beginning Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, the necessary staff to process serious incident reports. For FY 2006-07, Marin County has chosen to return the licensing function to the State. FCCH programs in the remaining 52 counties are licensed by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) Community Care Licensing (CCL) District Offices. The California Community Care Facilities Act authorizes participating counties to provide FCCH licensing services. Also, FCCH licensees are required to report any injury to a child requiring medical treatment, the death of any child, or any unusual incident or child absence that threatens the physical or emotional health or safety of any child while the child is in the care of the licensee.

In FY 2003-04, CDSS implemented a Targeted Visits protocol to streamline the annual review process of licensed care facilities to focus on facilities in which health and safety may be at greatest risk, or those facilities that require an annual visit as a condition of federal funding. A 10 percent sample of the remainder of the facilities is subject to annual unannounced visits. Current law requires that all facilities be visited at least once every five years. Also, if the number of citations increases by 10 percent over the prior year, the number of unannounced visits must also increase by 10 percent.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Health and Safety Code sections 1500 through 1519.
- The workload standard used to determine Full Time Equivalents (FTE) for targeted monitoring visits for FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 is 309 and 282 cases per worker, respectively.
- The worker to supervisor ratio used to determine FTEs is 6.35:1.
- The average statewide unit cost is held at the FY 2002-03 level of \$117,885.
- In FY 2005-06, \$30,000 was reinstated to the Child Health and Safety Fund (CHSF).

### METHODOLOGY:

#### FY 2005-06

The estimate was developed by determining the number of FTEs based on the FY 2005-06 projected average caseload of 3,778. This caseload was divided by the workload standard of 309 cases per worker to determine the number of nonsupervisory FTEs ( $3,778 \text{ caseload} \div 309$ ). The FTEs were then expanded to include supervisors at a ratio of 6.35:1 to derive the total number of FTEs ( $[12.23 \text{ FTEs} \div 6.35 \text{ supervisor ratio}] + 12.23 \text{ FTEs} = 14.15 \text{ FTEs}$ ). The average statewide unit cost was then multiplied by total FTEs. Beginning in FY 2005-06, \$80,000 is included in the Family Child Care Home Basic Costs premise for serious incident reporting and the \$30,000 from CHSF is reverted back to the Fund.

## Family Child Care Homes – Basic Costs

### METHODOLOGY (continued):

#### FY 2006-07

The estimate was developed by determining the number of FTEs based on the FY 2006-07 projected caseload of 3,683. This caseload was divided by the workload standard of 282 cases per worker to determine the number of nonsupervisory FTEs ( $3,683 \text{ caseload} \div 282$ ). The FTEs were then expanded to include supervisors at a ratio of 6.35:1 to derive the total number of FTEs ( $[13.06 \text{ FTEs} \div 6.35 \text{ supervisor ratio}] + 13.06 \text{ FTEs} = 15.12 \text{ FTEs}$ ). The average statewide unit cost was then multiplied by total FTEs.

### FUNDING:

In the Budget Act of 1999, the Legislature appropriated \$318,000 in reimbursement funds from the California Department of Education for licensing workers to conduct comprehensive annual site visits. This funding is a reimbursement through the Child Care Development Fund. The remaining costs are funded 100 percent State General Fund (GF).

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

FY 2006-07 does not include Marin County.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The five counties that contract with the State to perform FCCH licensing activities are currently staffed to conduct a 10 percent annual random of licensing functions which will not meet the statutory requirement that all facilities be visited at least once every five years. The increase reflects the necessary funds to meet the existing mandate of facility visits. Also, the average caseload is projected to increase.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,748	\$1,862
Federal	0	0
State	1,430	1,544
County	0	0
Reimbursements	318	318

---

## **Gresher v. Anderson**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs associated with implementation of the court ruling of *Gresher v. Anderson*. On February 25, 2005, the appellate court overturned an earlier trial court decision and ruled against the California Department of Social Services (CDSS). This case challenged background check procedures used by CDSS and counties for dealing with applicants with criminal records seeking employment or Trustline registration, and who need an exemption as part of their criminal background clearance in order to be employed as a caregiver. In particular, the *Gresher* decision will require the background check exemption process to include notification of the applicant of the following details:

- The conviction information that the county received and relied upon when determining the need for an exemption; and
- A summary of the reasons for denial of an exemption tailored to each specific case.

There are currently 41 counties providing Foster Family Home (FFH) licensing services and 6 counties providing Family Child Care Home (FCCH) licensing services.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 2005.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

This estimate reflects the local assistance cost for the additional time necessary for the issuance of exemption needed notices and exemption denied notices to individuals with criminal convictions requiring exemptions.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The annual cost is determined by multiplying the total hours, based on the number of exemption needed notices and exemption denied notices, divided by the full-time equivalent which equates to 0.21 for FFH and 0.09 for FCCH times the unit costs. The unit cost for the FFHs and for the FCCHs is being held at the FY 2002-03 level of \$125,663 and \$117,885, respectively.

#### **Foster Family Homes**

- In Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 the number of county exemption needed notices is estimated at 1,172 times 0.25 additional hours to review the rap sheet, identify specific convictions, and include the conviction details in the exemption needed notice. This equates to 293 total hours.
- In FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 the number of county exemption denied notices is estimated at 1,172 times 8 percent (statewide average of denied exemption notices) equals 94 times 0.25 additional hours to develop the language explaining the specific reasons for the denial and to incorporate them into the exemption denied notice. This equates to 24 total hours.



## **Gresher v. Anderson**

### **METHODOLOGY (continued):**

#### **Family Child Care Homes**

- In FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 the number of county exemption needed notices is estimated at 550 times 0.25 additional hours to review the rap sheet, identify specific convictions, and include the conviction details in the exemption needed notice. This equates to 138 total hours.
- In FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07 the number of county exemption denied notices is estimated at 550 times 8 percent (statewide average denied exemption notices) equals 44 times 0.25 additional hours to develop the language explaining the specific reasons for the denial and to incorporate them into the exemption denied notice. This equates to 11 total hours.

### **FUNDING:**

#### **Foster Family Homes**

After the federal discount rate of 75 percent is applied, the costs are shared 50 percent federal and 50 percent State General Fund (GF).

#### **Family Child Care Homes**

The funding is 100 percent GF. The FCCHs are ineligible for federal financial participation because the clientele are not foster youths.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

There is no change.

### **EXPENDITURES:**

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$37	\$37
Federal	10	10
State	27	27
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Court Cases

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for attorney fees and settlements resulting from lawsuits pertaining to the California Department of Social Services (CDSS), Budget Item 151 – Social Service Programs, specifically, Child Welfare Services, Special Programs, and Community Care Licensing.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

The attorney fees and settlement costs for these court cases will be paid in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and FY 2006-07.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

The estimate for settlement costs and attorney fees is based in part on actual payments for specific cases in the current year (CY), and a projection of costs that will be paid in CY and the budget year (BY). An additional \$50,000 is budgeted for new court cases in both CY and BY.

### FUNDING:

The legal fees and settlement amounts are funded 100 percent State General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The decrease in FY 2005-06 reflects a shift in attorney fees and settlements to FY 2006-07.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The decrease reflects a shift of attorney fees and settlements from FY 2005-06 to FY 2006-07, plus additional costs associated with the Gomez vs. Saenz case.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	County Admin.	County Admin.
Total	\$1,410	\$1,270
Federal	0	0
State	1,410	1,270
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## **Fee-Exempt Live Scan**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs for fingerprinting and search requirements associated with certain fee-exempt providers pursuant to Senate Bill (SB) 933 (Chapter 311, Statutes of 1998). SB 933 also mandated that a second set of fingerprints be submitted in order to search the records of the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Assembly Bill (AB) 1659 (Chapter 881, Statutes of 1999) added certain categories of licensed fee-exempt providers for FBI background checks.

This premise also includes the reimbursement cost for processing applications referred by the California Department of Education (CDE) and licensed fee-exempt providers.

The Community Care Licensing Division (CCLD) is responsible for processing the applications pursuant to AB 753 (Chapter 843, Statutes of 1997). CCLD contracts with the Department of Justice (DOJ) and the California Child Care Resource and Referral Network to process the fingerprint and index search file activities. Additionally, CCLD contracts with Sylvan/Identix, a private vendor, for the Live Scan fingerprinting. The Live Scan fingerprint process is an electronic technology that transfers images of fingerprints and personal information to DOJ in a matter of seconds.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on January 1, 1999.

### **KEY DATA ASSUMPTIONS:**

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11324.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The funding is suspended for Fiscal Years (FY) 2005-06 and 2006-07.

### **FUNDING:**

This premise is funded with 100 percent State General Fund.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

There is no change.

## Fee-Exempt Live Scan

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06 Contracts	2006-07 Contracts
Total	\$0	\$0
Federal	0	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Special Programs – Other Specialized Services

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs for the Foster Care Burial and Repatriated Americans Programs. Foster care burial costs are reimbursements by the State that are provided to foster parents for the costs of a burial plot and funeral expenses, up to \$5,000 per burial, for a child receiving foster care at the time of death.

The Repatriated Americans Program provides temporary help to needy United States citizens returning from foreign countries because of destitution, physical or mental illness, or war.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

#### Foster Care Burial

Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code (W&IC) section 11212.

#### Repatriated Americans

Authorizing statute: W&IC sections 10553 and 10554.

### METHODOLOGY:

#### Foster Care Burial

The estimated costs for both current and budget years are held at the Fiscal Year (FY) 1999-00 State General Fund expenditure level of \$186,000.

#### Repatriated Americans

The estimated costs for both current and budget years were held at the Budget Act of 2000 Appropriation level.

### FUNDING:

The Foster Care Burial program is funded with 100 percent State General Fund. The Repatriated Americans Program is funded with 100 percent federal funds through a special Department of Health and Human Services, U.S. Repatriate Program Direct Loan, which are provided to individuals on a repayable basis.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## Special Programs – Other Specialized Services

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$261	\$261
Federal	75	75
State	186	186
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Eligibility/Extension of Dog Food Allowance**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the costs associated with providing a monthly dog food allowance to recipients of federal Social Security Disability Insurance and Supplemental Security Income/State Supplementary Payments (SSI/SSP) and In-Home Supportive Services (IHSS) only Program participants who have incomes at or below the federal poverty level. Existing law provides that eligible individuals with guide, signal, or service dogs are eligible for a dog food allowance of \$50 per month.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on January 1, 2000.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statutes: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 12553 and 12554.
- Recipients will receive a monthly dog food allowance of \$50.
- The budget year caseload is projected to increase by 5.6 percent.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The current year and budget year estimates are based on year-to-date actual costs and projected caseload growth.

### **FUNDING:**

This program is funded with 100 percent State General Fund.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The increase in the budget year reflects projected caseload growth among Eligibility/Extension of Dog Food Allowance recipients.



## Eligibility Extension of Dog Food Allowance

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$514	\$536
Federal	0	0
State	514	536
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Access Assistance/Deaf Program

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the costs associated with the Office of Deaf Access, Access Assistance/Deaf Program. Assembly Bill 2980 (Chapter 1193, Statutes of 1980) established the Access Assistance/Deaf Program in 1980. The Deaf Access Program serves approximately 2.9 million deaf and hearing-impaired Californians through regional contractors. Assistance under this program enables deaf and hearing-impaired persons to access needed social and community services, e.g. employment services, counseling, interpreting services, education on deafness and advocacy. Currently, eight regional contractors provide services to the hearing-impaired in all 58 counties.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code Section 10621.
- The program funding of \$3,304,000 was augmented by \$2,500,000 in Fiscal Year (FY) 1998-99 for program expansion.
- The program is funded with \$3,200,000 in Title XX funds.

### METHODOLOGY:

The estimated costs for both current and budget years are held at the FY 1998-99 appropriation level.

### FUNDING:

This program is funded with \$2,604,000 State General Fund (GF). The Title XX block grant allocated to the program (\$3,200,000) reduces the amount of GF in the program.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$5,804	\$5,804
Federal	3,200	3,200
State	2,604	2,604
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Refugee Employment Social Services

### DESCRIPTION:

Refugee employment social services (RESS) are provided to refugees through county welfare departments and contracting agencies. The services are funded through an annual block grant allocation by the federal Office of Refugee Resettlement. The funds are used to provide employment-related services, such as employability assessment, on-the-job training, English language training, and vocational training.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 13275-13282.
- The federal grant includes \$7.4 million in standard funds and \$0.2 million in a set-aside fund to serve elderly refugees.
- A contract in the amount of \$0.6 million in Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and increasing to \$1.0 million in FY 2006-07 to serve unaccompanied refugee minors is included in total funding.

### METHODOLOGY:

Funding is based on federal award.

### FUNDING:

This program is 100 percent federally funded.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

Funding has increased due to a decrease in the grant to serve unaccompanied refugee minors.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The grant to serve unaccompanied refugee minors increases in the budget year.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$8,171	\$8,543
Federal	8,171	8,543
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## Refugee Programs – Targeted Assistance

### DESCRIPTION:

This program provides services to refugees to enable them to be placed in employment or to receive employment training. The goal of this program is to assist refugees in attaining self-sufficiency. Targeted Assistance (TA) grants are made available to high refugee-impacted counties. Program components include employment services, work experience, vocational training, vocational English-as-a-second-language, on-the-job training, economic development, skills upgrading, and extreme and unusual needs. In addition to regular TA funds, the federal government can award TA discretionary funds to the State for specific local projects. Local agencies develop project proposals in response to a federal announcement. The federal government selects the projects to be funded.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on October 1, 1983.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code sections 13275-13282.
- California's proposed TA allocation includes \$949,786 in discretionary funding for projects in various counties.
- The Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 allocation includes \$50,000 in discretionary funding to serve elderly refugees.

### METHODOLOGY:

Funding is based on federal award.

### FUNDING:

This program is 100 percent federally funded.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

Funding has decreased slightly due to a decrease in the standard TA grant award.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Elder discretionary funding of \$50,000 is awarded in FY 2005-06 only.

## Refugee Programs – Targeted Assistance

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$5,850	\$5,800
Federal	5,850	5,800
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Refugee School Impact Grant

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the federal funding granted to the Department by the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) to provide services to school-age refugee children and their families. The funding for this grant will be a pass-through from the Department to the California Department of Education (CDE). Services provided through local educational agencies will include intensive and innovative educational interventions to assist refugee children to improve English fluency and to progress toward grade-level proficiency.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: Title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations Part 92.
- A federal grant in the amount of \$1,360,000 was awarded in August 2005 to serve school-age refugee children and their families. The ORR has approved California to apply for continuation funding in the amount of \$1.7 million in the budget year.
- A Memorandum of Understanding between the CDE and the Department outlines the working relationship between the two departments and assigns responsibilities to each pursuant to the implementation of the grant.
- The services funded under this grant will serve the following counties: Alameda, Fresno, Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, and Santa Clara.

### METHODOLOGY:

Funding is based on federal award.

### FUNDING:

This program is 100 percent federally funded.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Costs increase due to funding of \$1.7 million in budget year.



## Refugee School Impact Grant

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06 Grant	2006-07 Grant
Total	\$1,360	\$1,700
Federal	1,360	1,700
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

On March 31, 2006, the United States Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) approved the Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project (CAP). The approved waiver allows Title IV-E (foster care assistance) funds, which are restricted to pay for board and care costs, as well as child welfare services administration, to be used for services and supports in order to avoid the over reliance on out-of-home care and reunify families more expeditiously. The intent of the CAP is to test a "capped allocation" strategy which would block grant some of the federal Title IV-E and state General Fund (GF). The California Department of Social Services (CDSS) has been working with the County Welfare Directors Association (CWDA) and interested counties to refine a model of practice and a fiscal model. The CAP will allow up to 20 counties to participate in the five year demonstration project.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

The current federal terms and conditions of the CAP require implementation between October 1, 2006 and January 1, 2007.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- An annual capped allocation for federal Title IV-E and GF will be established. The county will be required to provide the match required to draw down the federal and state capped grant funds.
- Counties will be required to submit a CAP plan for CDSS approval.
- There will be an undetermined Budget Year (BY) impact based on the final implementation date and the number of counties that will participate.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

- The CAP estimates will be based on statewide county Title IV-E expenditure claims submitted for State Fiscal Year 2004-05. Total Title IV-E expenditures will be separated into Budget Item 153 which will include Foster Care Assistance, Foster Care Administration, and Child Welfare Services and Administration. Currently, the BY impact is undetermined.
- Additional federal authority of \$25.5 million was included for county start up costs in BY.
- An additional \$10 million GF was also included for county start up costs in BY.

## **Title IV-E Child Welfare Waiver Demonstration Capped Allocation Project**

### **Funding:**

#### **Item 153**

Title IV-E funding and GF will be capped. Participating counties will be required to provide their matching share.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

This is a new premise.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

This is a new premise.

### **EXPENDITURES:**

	2005-06	2006-07
<b>Item 153 Capped Adjustment</b>	Services/Admin And Grants	Services/Admin And Grants
Total	\$0	\$ 35,549
Federal	0	25,549
State	0	10,000
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures Community Colleges – Expansion of Services to TANF Eligibles**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the State maintenance of effort (MOE) expenditures made by the California Community Colleges (CCC) for the purpose of assisting students who are Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program recipients, including those transitioning from TANF, to achieve long-term self-sufficiency through coordinated student services offered at community colleges.

Public Law 104-193, the federal welfare reform legislation, established the TANF Program and a TANF block grant to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) Program. For State Fiscal Years (FYs) 2005-06 and 2006-07, an adjustment has been made, which reflects the fact that California met the federal work participation rate for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program in Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2003 and 2004.

When the State meets this rate, the MOE level falls from 80 percent to 75 percent. In addition, adjustments are made to the MOE as a result of Tribal TANF. Therefore, with the Work Participation Rate and Tribal TANF MOE Adjustments, the final MOE level is \$2.7 billion.

The State may count either local and State expenditures made by California Department of Social Services (CDSS) or other departments on behalf of TANF/California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) eligible families toward the MOE. If these expenditures would have been authorized and allowable under the former AFDC, JOBS, Emergency Assistance, Child Care for AFDC recipients, At-Risk Child Care or Transitional Child Care programs in FFY 1995, all otherwise countable expenditures may count toward the MOE. However, if such expenditures were not previously authorized and allowable, countable expenditures are limited to the amount by which allowable current year expenditures exceed the total State program expenditures in FFY 1995. State expenditures that are used as a match to draw down other federal funding are generally not countable toward the TANF MOE.

Services provided by CCC include work-study, other educational-related work experience, job placement services, child care services, and coordination with county welfare offices to determine eligibility and availability of services. Current TANF recipients may utilize these services until their educational objectives are met, but for no longer than two years. Based on these expenditure requirements, these funds would meet the federal requirements for counting toward the TANF MOE.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: 45 Code of Federal Regulations sections 263.2 and 263.4.
- It is assumed the eligible MOE expenditures will be \$34.6 million in FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07.
- These funds are required to be expended for educational-related services for CalWORKs Program eligible recipients only.

## Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures Community Colleges – Expansion of Services to TANF Eligibles

### METHODOLOGY:

For FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07, the estimate reflects the anticipated MOE-eligible expenditures.

### FUNDING:

This program is funded with 100 percent State General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$34,580	\$34,580
Federal	0	0
State	34,580	34,580
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures CDE Child Care Programs

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the State maintenance of effort (MOE) expenditures made by the California Department of Education (CDE) for child care programs that provide services for California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs)/Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program. This premise also reflects expenditures for those who are income eligible but not participating in CalWORKs/TANF program.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193, the federal welfare reform legislation, established the TANF Program and a TANF block grant to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) Program. States must meet an 80 percent MOE to receive their full block grant allocation. For State Fiscal Years (FYs) 2005-06 and 2006-07, an adjustment has been added, which reflects the fact that California met the federal work participation rate for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program in Federal Fiscal Year (FFYs) 2003 and 2004. When the State meets this rate, the MOE level falls from 80 percent to 75 percent. In addition, adjustments are made to the MOE as a result of Tribal TANF. Therefore, with the Work Participation Rate and Tribal TANF MOE Adjustments, the final MOE level is \$2.7 billion.

The State may count both local and state expenditures made by the California Department of Social Services or other departments on behalf of TANF/CalWORKs-eligible families toward the MOE. If these expenditures would have been authorized and allowable under the former AFDC, JOBS, Emergency Assistance, Child Care for AFDC recipients, At-Risk Child Care or Transitional Child Care programs in FFY 1995, all otherwise countable expenditures may count toward the MOE. However, if such expenditures were not previously authorized and allowable, countable expenditures are limited to the amount by which allowable current year expenditures exceed the total State program expenditures in FFY 1995. State expenditures that are used as a match to draw down other federal funding are generally not countable toward the TANF MOE.

Before the implementation of federal welfare reform, California received federal funding for child care through Title IV-A of the Social Security Act and the Child Care and Development Block Grant (CCDBG). Title IV-A funds were used to provide child care for families on welfare, those transitioning off welfare, and those at risk of going on welfare. CCDBG funds were used to provide child care for the working poor. As a part of federal welfare reform under P.L. 104-193, these two federal child care funding streams were merged into the new Child Care and Development Fund (CCDF). In order for states to receive this portion of the CCDF, they are required to spend a level of funding equal to their FFY 1994 nonfederal share of child care expenditures under the old Title IV-A Program (\$85.6 million in California). Federal regulations will allow state expenditures for child care to satisfy both the CCDF MOE and TANF Program MOE, provided that these expenditures meet the MOE requirements for both grants. In addition, if a state has additional child care expenditures, i.e., expenditures that have not been used toward meeting the CCDF MOE requirement or to receive federal matching funds, these expenditures may count toward the state's TANF MOE, provided that the benefiting families meet the state's definition for TANF eligibility. All other TANF MOE requirements and limitations, as set forth in federal regulations, must also be met.

---

## Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures CDE Child Care Programs

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 1997.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- Authorizing statute: 45 Code of Federal Regulations Sections 263.2 and 263.3.
- The FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07 estimates are held to the FY 2005-06 appropriation level.
- Based on estimated general fund expenditures for CalWORKs recipients and CalWORKs Eligibles in CDE child care programs, it is assumed the eligible MOE expenditures will be \$435.2 million in FY 2005-06 and \$435.2 million in FY 2006-07.
- Federal regulations allow state expenditures for child care to satisfy both the CCDF MOE and the TANF MOE, provided that these expenditures meet the MOE requirements for both grants.
- All TANF/CalWORKs-eligible families meet CCDF eligibility requirements and would, therefore, meet both the CCDF and TANF MOE expenditure requirements.
- The total "double-countable" expenditures cannot exceed the MOE level for the CCDF (\$85.6 million).

### METHODOLOGY:

For FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07, the estimate reflects the anticipated MOE-eligible expenditures.

### FUNDING:

This program is funded with 100 percent State General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

There is no change.

## Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures CDE Child Care Programs

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$435,177	\$435,177
Federal	0	0
State	435,177	435,177
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0



***This page left intentionally  
blank for spacing***

## **Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures \$50 State Disregard Payment to Families**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the State maintenance of effort (MOE) expenditures made by the Department of Child Support Services (DCSS) for the \$50 State Disregard Payment to Families for current recipients of benefits under the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program.

Public Law (P.L.) 104-193, the federal welfare reform legislation, established the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program and a TANF block grant to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) Program. For State Fiscal Years (FYs) 2004-05 and 2005-06, an adjustment has been added, which reflects the fact that California met the federal work participation rate for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program in Federal Fiscal Years (FFYs) 2002 and 2003. When the State meets this rate, the MOE level falls from 80 percent to 75 percent. In addition, adjustments are made to the MOE as a result of Tribal TANF. Therefore, with the Work Participation Rate and Tribal TANF MOE Adjustments, the final MOE level is \$2.7 billion.

The State may count both local and state expenditures made by CDSS or other departments on behalf of TANF/CalWORKs-eligible families toward the MOE. If these expenditures would have been authorized and allowable under the former AFDC, JOBS, Emergency Assistance, Child Care for AFDC recipients, At-Risk Child Care or Transitional Child Care programs in FFY 1995, all otherwise countable expenditures may count toward the MOE. However, if such expenditures were not previously authorized and allowable, countable expenditures are limited to the amount by which allowable current year expenditures exceed the total State program expenditures in FFY 1995. State expenditures that are used as a match to draw down other federal funding are generally not countable toward the TANF MOE.

In addition to the regular aid grant, custodial parents also receive the first \$50 of the current month's child support payment collected from the absent parent. Forwarding the disregard portion of the collection to the family instead of retaining it to abate government's cost of the aid grant results in cost increases (lost collection revenues).

Under the provisions of P.L. 104-193, the federal government discontinued federal financial participation in the disregard payment to the family as of October 1, 1996. Therefore, this premise reflects the cost for the State to fund the entire \$50 disregard payment to the custodial parent.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This program was originally implemented in FY 1984-85.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: Welfare and Institutions Code section 11475.3 and Family Code section 17504.
- It is assumed the eligible MOE expenditures claimed by DCSS will be \$30.7 million in FY 2005-06 and \$31.4 million in FY 2006-07. The estimate is based on projected expenditures from the DCSS.

## Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures \$50 State Disregard Payment to Families

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS (continued):

- The child support payment data are based on the counties' monthly CS 35 Reports, Child Support Services Supplement to the CS 34 Monthly Report of Collections and Distributions, for July 2003 through June 2005.

### METHODOLOGY:

The cost of the current \$50 disregard is reported monthly on the CS 35 Report. The disregard is paid when the child support collection is distributed.

### FUNDING:

This program is funded with 100 percent State General Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The current year was updated to reflect the anticipated MOE eligible expenditures.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase for the budget year reflects the anticipated MOE eligible expenditures.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$30,690	\$31,425
Federal	0	0
State	30,690	31,425
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures EDD – Employment Training Fund Program**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects the State maintenance of effort (MOE) expenditures made by the California Employment Development Department (EDD) for the Employment Training Fund Program.

As a result of Public Law 104-193, the federal welfare reform legislation establishing the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program and a TANF block grant to replace the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) Program, States must meet an 80 percent MOE to receive their full block grant allocation. For State Fiscal Years (FYs) 2005-06 and 2006-07, an adjustment has been added, which reflects the fact that California met the federal work participation rate for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program in FFYs 2003 and 2004. When the State meets this rate, the MOE level falls from 80 percent to 75 percent. In addition, adjustments are made to the MOE as a result of Tribal TANF. Therefore, with the Work Participation Rate and Tribal TANF MOE Adjustments, the final MOE level is \$2.7 billion.

The State may count both local and state expenditures made by CDSS or other departments on behalf of TANF/CalWORKs-eligible families toward the MOE. If these expenditures would have been authorized and allowable under the former AFDC, JOBS, Emergency Assistance, Child Care for AFDC recipients, At-Risk Child Care or Transitional Child Care programs in FFY 1995, all otherwise countable expenditures may count toward the MOE. However, if such expenditures were not previously authorized and allowable, countable expenditures are limited to the amount by which allowable current year expenditures exceed the total State program expenditures in FFY 1995. State expenditures that are used as a match to draw down other federal funding are generally not countable toward the TANF MOE.

Based on the Code 45 of Federal Regulations section 263.2, pro rata charges are considered administrative costs for TANF MOE purposes. Pro rata is the apportionment of central service agency costs (e.g., Finance, Controller, Personnel Board, Legislature) incurred by the State General Fund and billed to other funds.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

This premise implemented on July 1, 2003.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- Authorizing statute: 45 Code of Federal Regulations section 263.0 and section 263.2.
- The pro-rata assessment to the Employment Training Fund is \$80,000 for Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06 and \$87,000 for FY 2006-07.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

For FYs 2005-06 and 2006-07, the estimate reflects the anticipated MOE eligible expenditures.

## Other Departments' TANF MOE Eligible Expenditures EDD – Employment Training Fund Program

### FUNDING:

This program is funded with 100 percent Employment Training Fund.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Additional pro rata charges are anticipated in the budget year.

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	\$80	\$87
Federal	0	0
State	80	87
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **General Fund Maintenance of Effort Work Participation Rate Reductions**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects adjustments made on the Department's federal reports for prior federal fiscal years (FFYs) that reduce the State's maintenance of effort (MOE) requirement from 80 percent of the base year expenditures to 75 percent. These adjustments are the result of meeting the federal work participation rates for the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program.

The Department assumes an 80 percent MOE requirement until notified by the federal government that the State has met the federal work participation rates. This typically occurs after the end of the FFY. After notification by the federal government, the Department files an amended federal report for that past FFY to reflect the lower MOE expenditure level of 75 percent. Therefore, State Fiscal Year (FY) 2004-05 reflects the adjustment for FFY 2002. FY 2005-06 reflects the adjustment for FFY 2003.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

The Work Participation Rate adjustments are not made until after the federal government has notified the State that it has met the rate for the FFY. This does not occur until after the end of the FFY for which the adjustment is being made.

### **METHODOLOGY:**

The FFYs 2002 and 2003 adjustments were determined by adjusting the MOE levels for those years to 75 percent. This results in reductions of \$180.1 million which is displayed in FY 2004-05, and \$179.9 which is displayed in FY 2005-06.

Because of the overlapping quarter between the FFY and the FY, the Department is able to reflect the impact of the MOE reduction in a later FY. Accordingly, the State General Fund (GF) expenditure reductions are not reflected in the State Budget until FY 2005-06 and FY 2006-07. These adjustments do not, however, bring the MOE expenditure level below the federal requirement for any FFY.

### **FUNDING:**

The funding is 100 percent GF.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

There is no change.

### **REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:**

The decrease in BY is due to an increase in the amount of Federal Funds transferred to Tribal TANF.

## General Fund Maintenance of Effort Work Participation Rate Reductions

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
	Grant	Grant
Total	-\$179,898	-\$179,546
Federal	0	0
State	-179,898	-179,546
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## High Performance Bonus Award

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds awarded to the State of California by the federal government for moving welfare recipients to work and sustaining their success in the workforce. The High Performance Bonus is part of the TANF Program which is authorized under Section 403(a)(4) of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act. Funds are awarded based on state rankings on each of the following four work-related measures: (1) Job Entry Rate; (2) Success in the Workforce; (3) Improvement in the Job Entry Rate; and (4) Improvement in the Workforce. Beginning Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2002, non-work related measures were added to provide awards based on access to health care, Food Stamps and Child Care for low-income families. A family formation and stability improvement measure was also added.

High Performance Bonus funds will be used to meet the needs of the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids and TANF programs, as determined by the California Department of Social Services and approved by the Department of Finance and the California Health and Human Services Agency.

The Federal Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 eliminates High Performance Bonus Awards to states, after September 30, 2006. All bonus awards have already been released to states.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on January 1, 2000.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

California was awarded \$8.1 million for the Child Care Subsidy Measure and \$4.8 million for Family Formation and Stability Improvement measures in FFY 2004. It is not assumed that California will receive an award in State Fiscal Year (FY) 2006-07.

### FUNDING:

The funding is 100 percent TANF.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

There is no change.

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The High Performance Bonus Awards are not announced on a consistent year-to-year basis. There have been delays in the announcement of these awards in the past few years; therefore, it is assumed that California will not receive an award in FY 2006-07.



## High Performance Bonus Award

### EXPENDITURES:

(in 000's)

	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$12,922	\$0
Federal	12,922	0
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## Total TANF Reserve

### DESCRIPTION:

This premise reflects the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds that are held in reserve to meet unanticipated pressures in the California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids (CalWORKs) Program. Expenditures as determined by the California Department of Social Services (CDSS) are subject to Legislative notification and approval by the California Health and Human Services Agency and the Department of Finance.

### IMPLEMENTATION DATE:

This premise implemented on July 1, 2000.

### KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:

- The reserve was originally established by the Budget Act of 2000.
- The Total TANF Reserve funds are used to meet unforeseen program needs in the CalWORKs Program.

### METHODOLOGY:

For Fiscal Year (FY) 2005-06, \$34.6 million has been placed in the reserve for child care and other unforeseen expenses.

For FY 2006-07, \$164.0 million has been placed in the reserve, \$40.0 million for performance incentives to be paid out in FY 2007-08 and \$124.0 million for other unforeseen expenses.

Beginning in FY 2007-08, CDSS will begin measuring and publishing county performance outcomes. The \$40.0 million incentives will be paid to those counties who meet or exceed program outcome goals.

County performance will be evaluated on the following outcome measures:

- Employment rate of county CalWORKs cases
- Modified federal participation rate that accounts for State allowable activities of county CalWORKs cases.
- Percentage of county CalWORKs cases that have earned income three months after ceasing to receive assistance.

### FUNDING:

This premise is funded with 100 percent federal TANF funds.

### CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:

The reserve reflects a decrease due to decreased general reserve funding.

## Total TANF Reserve

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

The increase in the budget year is necessary to ensure that funding is available for unforeseen expenses.

### RESERVE:

(in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$34,553	\$164,055
Federal	34,553	164,055
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0

## **TANF Reauthorization Reserve**

### **DESCRIPTION:**

This premise reflects Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds that are held in reserve to offset potential costs associated with program changes deemed necessary to meet the requirements of the TANF law. The Federal Budget Reconciliation Act recently passed by Congress reauthorized TANF with significant changes to the program and potentially substantial impacts to California. The amount of TANF funding remains unchanged; however, provisions contained in the Act may significantly impact California's ability to meet the work participation requirements, which may result in the state being liable for substantial penalties.

### **IMPLEMENTATION DATE:**

Funds are held in reserve for potential costs in Fiscal Year 2006/07.

### **KEY DATA/ASSUMPTIONS:**

- CDSS has engaged in discussions with the Federal Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) to provide input and recommendations to the development of new federal regulations pertaining to TANF Reauthorization. The final federal regulations, due to be released by June 30, 2006, with an effective date of October 1, 2006, will determine potential penalties, and effects on the State's MOE programs, resulting in impacts on grants, child care, and employment services, and the impact to current data reporting verification methods.
- In order to determine how to best approach the changes associated with TANF Reauthorization, a Stakeholders Workgroup has been established and is currently engaged in discussing strategies that will help to reduce the adverse impact of the changes to the program, with the focus on strategies designed to increase the level of working recipients, mitigate the risk of fiscal penalties, and move recipients towards self sufficiency.

### **FUNDING:**

This premise is funded with 100 percent federal TANF funds.

### **CHANGE FROM PRIOR SUBVENTION:**

This is a new premise.

## TANF Reauthorization Reserve

### REASON FOR YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGE:

Any program changes associated with TANF Reauthorization will not be implemented until the budget year

### RESERVE:

in 000's)	2005-06	2006-07
Total	\$0	\$114,629
Federal	0	114,629
State	0	0
County	0	0
Reimbursements	0	0